

JPRS-TAC-86-045

6 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

6 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow: U.S. Violates Geneva Pledge on Space Militarization (Moscow World Service, 14 May 86).....	1
Soviet Marshal Kurkotkin: SDI Effort To 'Weaken' USSR (Moscow TASS, 6 May 86).....	2
TASS Reports on Continuing U.S. Debates on SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates).....	3
Arthur Burns Cited	3
Congressman, Scientist Cited	3
Abrahamson Report	5
NASA Role	5
European, U.S. Appeal	6
ABM Treaty Threatened	7
Soviet Weekly on SDI Drawbacks, Possible Countermeasures (G. Arniyevich; Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 12, 18 Mar 86).....	9
TASS on Opposition to SDI Participation in FRG (Moscow TASS, 23, 29 Apr 86).....	11
Social Democrats, Greens	11
SDP Presidium Statement	11

Moscow Assails Israeli-U.S. SDI Agreement (Moscow World Service, 7 May 86; Moscow Radio Peace and Progress, 8 May 86).....	13
Aimed at Middle East	13
'Rearm Israel Aggressors'	14
TASS Criticizes Japanese Defense Minister on SDI (Moscow TASS, 14 May 86).....	16
Israel's Moshe Arens Urges Japan's SDI Participation (Tokyo KYODO, 13 May 86).....	18
NTT Willing To Participate in SDI Research (Tokyo KYODO, 17 May 86).....	20
Briefs	
USSR Cosmonaut on SDI	21
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
USSR: Allies Have No Veto Over Launch of U.S. Euromissiles (A. Oganessian; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 15, 8 Apr 86).....	22
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Dutch Socialist Opposes Production of Chemical Arms (Piet Dankert; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 21 Apr 86).....	24
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
CPSU's Yeltsin Comments on Gorbachev 18 April Proposal (Moscow TASS, 7 May 86).....	26
Delegation Arrives in Bonn	26
DIE ZEIT Interviews Yeltsin	26
USSR: Further Comments on Gorbachev 18 April Proposal (Various sources, various dates).....	29
WEU Session	29
Timing Explained, by Lev Semeiko	30
GDR, CSSR Backing	32
CSCE Madrid Meeting	33
Soviet Army Paper: Europe Faces 'Choice' on Arms Cuts (V. Kuzar; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 27 Apr 86).....	34

TASS Reports on May MBFR Session (Moscow TASS, 14, 15 May 86).....	38
Soviet Delegation Arrives	38
GDR Delegate Speaks	38
Western Claims of Pact Superiority Disputed (Moscow Radio Peace and Progress, 16 Mar 86).....	39
PRAVDA on Gorbachev Berlin Speech, Western Response (Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Apr 86).....	41
USSR Deputy Chief of Staff Writes on Warsaw Pact Jubilee (V. Verevkin-Rakhalskiy; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 13 May 86)..	46

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Soviet Weekly on U.S. Refusal To Join Test Moratorium (Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 5, 28 Jan-3 Feb, No 13, 25 Mar 86).....	49
Comparative Statistics	49
U.S. Claims Refuted	50
USSR: Comments on Moratorium Extension, U.S. Response (Various sources, various dates).....	53
Reagan 'Propaganda Trick'	53
TV Correspondents Discussion	53
Broadcast to North America	56
Senator Byrd's Comments Hit	57
Soviet CSCE Official Cited	58
Warnke 'Welcomes' Decision	59
'U.S. Seeks Military Superiority'	59
U.S. 'Panamint' Test 21 May	60
Test Replies to Ban Appeal	61
U.S. 'Service Record' Noted	62
Antinuclear Protestors 'Repressed'	63
IZVESTIYA: U.S. Tests More Serious Than Chernobyl (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 6 May 86).....	64
Soviet Embassy in U.S. Meets With Public Groups on Test Ban (Moscow TASS, 8 May 86).....	66
Moscow Cites BILD, Kohl Urges U.S.-Soviet Talks on Test Ban (Moscow Television Service, 16 May 86).....	67
PRAVDA On Importance of Nuclear Disarmament for Asia (Moscow PRAVDA, 12 May 86).....	68

Iceland Foreign Minister Gives Views on Nordic Zone Issue (Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID, 10 Apr 86).....	72
History of Soviet Backing for Nordic NFZ (G. Kartsev; Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 12, 18 Mar 86).....	73
Iceland's Leading Newspaper on Gorbachev Test Ban Bid (Editorial; Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID, 2 Apr 86).....	77
High Radioactivity Level After 10 April Nevada Test Noted (Moscow TASS, 15 May 86).....	79
Briefs	
Australia: Nuclear-Free Treaty	80

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. Uses 'Verification Problem' To Block Agreements (A. Podberezkin, A. Chapis; Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 16, 15 Apr 86).....	81
PRAVDA: Chernobyl Highlights Urgency of Nuclear Disarmament (Moscow PRAVDA, 20 May 86).....	86
IZVESTIYA Holds Soviet-U.S. Discussion on Nuclear Danger (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 May 86).....	90
USSR Paper Hosts Roundtable on Test Ban, Nuclear Winter, SDI (P. Vedenyapin, et al.; Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Apr 86).....	94
Mongolian Foreign Minister Backs U.S. on Asian Security (M. Dugersuren Interview; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 2 May 86).....	101
Canada's Mulroney on Scaled Down Defense Policy (Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 1 May 86).....	103
Canada: Peace Demonstrations Protest Cruise Missile Testing (Erike Rosenfeld; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 28 Apr 86)....	104

/6539

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: U.S. VIOLATES GENEVA PLEDGE ON SPACE MILITARIZATION

LD141504 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 14 May 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] The United States assistant defense secretary, Richard Perle, has said that the first components of a space weapons system being developed under President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative are going to be deployed in space within 10 years.

Washington has now taken practical steps to turn outer space into its military stronghold, to start an arms race there which would have unpredictable and irretrievable consequences. The fundamental agreement not to allow the militarization of space reached at the Soviet-American summit last November has been violated. One has to ask again and again, can the promises made by the Washington administration be trusted? Washington has been claiming that the SDI would rule out a Soviet missile to attack anyone. Unlike the United States its promised not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. As for the elimination of such weapons isn't it more reasonable to abandon the development of extremely dangerous space armaments in favor of taking the way offered by the Soviet Union and start eliminating nuclear stockpiles now?

However, the way prompted by reason is not the one preferred by Washington politicians. They need the SDI not for defense but for allowing the United States to develop first-strike capability by hiding behind a space shield. The Pentagon hopes that space weapons would make it possible to keep the entire world at gunpoint. The SDI is not a space shield, it is a space sword. It is not accidental that President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative has been dubbed the star wars program.

It is worth giving serious thought to the threat posed to humanity by the implementation of the program. The accident at the Soviet nuclear power plant in Chernobyl has shown that even peaceful use of nuclear energy is fraught with risks. It is clear that a military nuclear conflict would spell catastrophe. The SDI is going to markedly increase the risk of such a disaster.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET MARSHAL KURKOTKIN: SDI EFFORT TO 'WEAKEN' U.S.A

LD061036 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 6 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 6, TASS--The USSR and the other countries of the socialist community stand for constructive talks on all aspects on a basis of equal security but will not permit U.S. and NATO military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty countries, Marshal of the Soviet Union Semen Kurkotkin, a deputy defense minister of the USSR, said in an interview with newsmen on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the routing of Nazi Germany.

He stressed the danger to peace flowing from the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" which provides for using space-strike weapons and upgrading U.S. offensive strategic forces.

"The ultimate goal of these plans is to weaken the Soviet Union with a pre-emptive strike in order to protect itself from a retaliatory blow by Soviet strategic nuclear forces," Marshal Kurkotkin said. "The United States hopes for the venture to go with impunity but the Soviet Union will, if necessary, find a convincing answer to the challenge."

"Thanks to advances in the economy, science and technology," he said, "the USSR has everything necessary to ensure its security. Acting in a close spirited alliance with fraternal armies, the Armed Forces of the USSR are always on guard and in constant readiness to cool the zeal of any aggressor."

"At the same time the USSR is against the absurd logic of building up arms," Marshal Kurkotkin said. He recalled that the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has defined the main task of the country's foreign policy in the coming years as that of working to put an end to the arms race, prevent it from spreading to outer space and secure a complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation by the end of this century. While keeping in force its proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons and bridling the arms race, the USSR has put forward yet another initiative on conventional armed forces in Europe, which provides for reducing such forces from the Atlantic to the Urais under proper international control, up to and including on-site inspections. "Its implementation," he said, "would improve the international situation and deliver the European nations from fear of falling victim to the third world war."

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS ON CONTINUING U.S. DEBATES ON SDI

Arthur Burns Cited

ID011540 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 1 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 1, TASS-TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

The U.S. is going to draw its allies even further into the implementation of the "star wars" program and to take advantage of their scientific and technological potential for creating strike space weapons.

This was openly stated at the conference held here on the impact of the SDI on national security problems organized by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, the National Defense University and the U.S. Army Military College.

Arthur Burns, former U.S. ambassador to West Germany and at present a worker of the American Enterprise Institute, admitted that the U.S. allies' support for the program on the part of West Europeans, it is necessary to achieve greater accord among the NATO members in questions dealing with the political and military consequences of the creation of strategic defense.

In other words, the U.S. demands that West Europeans obediently go along with Washington's policy aimed at achieving military superiority through the militarization of outer space.

A. Burns also demanded that the U.S. allies take a more active part in the creation of the large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements.

Congressman, Scientist Cited

LD082310 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 8, TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

By putting the arms race into a still higher gear and planning its spread into outer space, the U.S. administration undermines national security rather than bolsters it. This conclusion is made by an increasingly larger number of U.S. politicians, public figures and scientists.

Lee Hamilton, a member of the House of Representatives, Democrat, Indiana, points out, for instance, that the administration's course of "rearming America" undermines the foundation of the U.S. economy--the level and scope of research work aimed at advancing the U.S. economy as a whole, since an increasingly larger share of spending on research and development is earmarked for military ends.

In the 70's, the congressman says, the federal appropriations for research and development were divided approximately equally between the arms manufacturing industry and civilian branches. At present, military spending exceeds twice allocations for peaceful needs. Over the present administration's term of office, the funds put in military research and development programmes went up by 93 percent while the funds for civilian research and development programmes shrank by 17 percent.

The administration's policy has brought about a situation where as a result of overspending on military research and development the United States began lagging behind Japan, for instance, in a whole number of major science-intensive branches, Hamilton stressed.

The "star wars" programme and the spending it incurs sparks off an exceptionally deep worry and among many people in the United States. The administration projects this programme as a certain concern about U.S. security and even as a manifestation of its aspiration to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

David Parnas, a scientific consultant of a research laboratory of the U.S. Navy, drew attention to the total incompatibility of such contentions with the real state of things. In an article published in the COMMON CAUSE magazine, he writes that being a member of the SDI scientific advisory panel on computing in support of battle management he arrived at the conclusion that the funds invested in the SDI project and hundreds of billions of dollars planned for investment into the deployment of space-based weapons systems would fail to create an impenetrable shield for the United States.

Research shows that this is simply not technically feasible, he stressed. It is absolutely impossible to develop such a computer software for the SDI, which would be totally guaranteed against errors. The "star wars" programme would force the Soviet Union to build up nuclear offensive arms to offset the SDI, which would lead to continued build-up of such armaments by the United States. So, the scientist writes, "The arms race would speed up. Even worse, because we would be wasting an immense amount of effort on a system we could not trust, we would see a weakening of our relative strength. Instead of safer world that President Reagan envisions, we would have a far more dangerous situation."

Parnas Emphasizes that this view is shared by the overwhelming number of scientists and specialists involved in developments under the SDI, but they prefer to button their lips. The scientist urges his colleagues to renounce, as he did, participation in the deception which is the "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the administration, a deception which is gross and is fraught with mortal danger to the whole world.

Abrahamson Report

LD101457 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 10 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 10, TASS--TASS correspondent N. Orekhov reports:

The Pentagon intends to press for the implementation of the programme to militarise outer space, disregarding the need to spend billions of dollars for the purpose and without waiting for the U.S. congressional decision. It follows from a report received by the Associated Press from Strategic Defence Initiative Director Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson that the U.S. Department of Defence intends to drop the criterion of cost in adopting the final decision of the question of the expediency of deploying a space-based ABM system.

Representatives of the administration assured the U.S. public more than once in the past that the USA will deploy such a system only if it will be, among other things, "cost effective at the margin," that is, less expensive than new weapons designed to penetrate it.

Fearing that the 'DI programme will be only an initiative stage of the extremely costly race of space arms, members of the U.S. Congress adopted an amendment to the bill on military appropriations for the 1986 financial year that prohibits adopting a decision on the deployment of "star wars" system unless it is "cost effective at the margin."

It follows from Abrahamson's report, however, that the Pentagon has no intention of following the decisions of the supreme legislative body, and that it is striving to start the deployment of space-based weapons as soon as its first samples are created.

Commenting on the issuing of the report, Senator Larry Pressler said that the Pentagon actually plans an inroad into the U.S. Department of the Treasury. The senator's warnings are not without grounds, since an expert estimate, the attempt to implement the "star wars" programme will cost the USA hundreds of billions, and possibly, even a thousand billion dollars.

NASA Role

LD121847 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 12 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 12, TASS--U.S. President Ronald Reagan today swore in James Fletcher as head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Fletcher succeeds James Beggs who has had to resign over the charges of involvement in all manner of machinations, which have been levelled at him.

Commentators take the view that the new NASA administrator will try to lend an even more pronounced military thrust to the U.S. space programs. This is because Fletcher has played a no small role in working out the notorious

Strategic Defense Initiative in keeping with which the United States is now making a great effort to develop an array of arms for "star wars."

European, U.S. Appeal

LP151746 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 15, TASS--TASS Commentator Vladimir Mostovets writes:

The message of an international appeal addressed to the heads of state and government by more than 110 prominent politicians, public figures and scientists of the USA, Canada and 10 European countries is the need to raise a strong barrier to a new round of the arms race and to prevent its spread into outer space.

There are among the signatories of the appeal former West German Federal Chancellor Willy Brandt, former Prime Ministers Edward Heath of Britain, Anker Jorgensen of Denmark, Per Borten of Norway and Joop den Uyl of the Netherlands, and scientists Hans Bethe, Carl Sagan and John Galbraith.

The authors of the appeal point out the dangerous delusion of those who still believe that the deployment of strike weapons in space can ensure "dependable protection" from nuclear missiles and even will make nuclear weapons; they are likely to make nuclear war more probable rather than avert it. The implementation of Reagan's "star wars" plans along with a strategic offensive arms buildup now carried out by the USA, the authors of the appeal believe, only testifies to U.S. aggressive policy aimed at acquiring the first-strike potential. They warn against the catastrophic consequences of the uncontrollable space arms race to mankind and urge all the governments to oppose the development of space weapons of any type.

The representative list of the signatories of the appeal testifies to the serious worry of the international public over the militarist course of the Reagan administration, which irresponsibly gambles with the fate of the world. More and more Americans in the USA itself are growing aware that the further continuation of the arms race, let alone its projection into space, will sooner or later lead to nuclear catastrophe. Small wonder that more than 6,500 American scientists and engineers, including 15 Nobel Prize winners, have already stated their resolve not to contribute in any way to the development of space strike weapons under the "star wars" program.

One does not have to be a specialist to understand the perfectly obvious fact that a ban on nuclear testing is an essential and most important step towards dependable arms control. That is why the bold and resolute initiatives of the Soviet Union in that field have evoked broad positive responses in the USA, where the White House is being urged more and more often to join the USSR and reach accord on a bilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The idea of a moratorium has won support among many law-makers in Congress. Addressing the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations the other day, Republican Senator Daniel Evans said that the question of banning nuclear tests was bearing on human survival as such.

Senator Claiborne Pell, for his part, speaking for a number of influential members of Congress, characterized it as outrageous that the White House has more than once turned down the Soviet Union's proposal on a mutual nuclear test ban and other Soviet initiatives on disarmament.

Despite the attempts of the U.S. administration to belittle the importance of the Soviet initiatives and to misrepresent them, more and more Americans are speaking in favour of the Soviet Union's broad peace proposals, aimed at the removal of the threat of nuclear war and at safeguarding world peace. They are demanding more and more resolutely from the White House that an end be put to nuclear madness on earth and that the dangerous plans to militarize space be dropped. They understand that if this is not done already today, tomorrow it will be too late.

ABM Treaty Threatened

LD191658 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 19 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 19, TASS--TASS News Analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The White House, seeking to protect its product--the 'Strategic Defence Initiative' (SDI)--from possible congressional budget cuts, resorts to direct pressure on Congress, to put it mildly. The government Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) has sent a special report to Capitol Hill. The report conveys a thinly-veiled threat, as THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper reports today, that the U.S. administration "may reconsider its commitment" to the ABM Treaty if Congress does not fully endorse the asked appropriations for the "star wars" programme. The ACDA report maintains that the administration's current research within the framework of the SDI "is consistent with a strict interpretation of the ABM Treaty."

But "if adequate support is not forthcoming," the report says, the administration may have to "adopt a looser interpretation of the treaty's provisions."

The very way of setting the task of establishing a large-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements which underlies the SDI runs counter to the letter and spirit of the ABM Treaty which was concluded between the USSR and USA in 1972. It must be recalled that the treaty makes it binding upon the USSR and the USA not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the territory of the country and not to provide a base for such a defense. ABM components of one ABM system deployment area specified by the treaty shall be deployed on land and be stationary. It is banned to develop, test or deploy ABM systems of components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based.

In light of this, assertions by the authors of the ACDA report about an ostensibly "strict interpretation" of the ABM Treaty provisions by the U.S. side look quite untenable. Having proclaimed a programme for the development of an ABM system for the defence of the territories of the USA and of its NATO allies, Washington does not conceal that the system should have space-based elements which are banned by the treaty.

Lots of authoritative pronouncements have already been made in argument that the SDI is being ostensibly contemplated as a certain 'space sword' with an eye to the possibility of a first strike. The militarisation of outer space not only sharply broadens the sphere of the dangerous arms race. The development of space-strike weapons narrows possibilities for taking political decisions on matters of war and peace in the event of crisis situations. The military and political importance of the ABM Treaty is quite great.

As is emphasized in the very preamble to the treaty, it is a substantial factor in curbing a further build up of the most powerful arms and in maintaining strategic balance. Its stabilising role serves to ensure conditions for the elaboration of possible new agreements on limiting and reducing nuclear arms.

Therefore, as the Soviet Union has stated already more than once, any actions running counter to the treaty and being of detriment to it should be ruled out. As for the ACDA report which we have quoted and which was prepared for the U.S. Congress, one can see in it an obvious line towards washing out the ABM Treaty and towards using the "star wars" programme as a stimulus to a further arms race.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET WEEKLY ON SDI DRAWBACKS, POSSIBLE COUNTERMEASURES

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 12, 18 Mar 86 p 1

[Article by G. Arniyevich: "The Response Will Be Effective"]

[Text] The defenders of the American so-called "strategic defense initiative," which in essence has absolutely nothing in common with defense and security, are thinking up various arguments. They include the following one: the Soviet Union is criticizing the Star Wars so sharply because it is "afraid" of it, since the Soviet Union, they say, does not have anything to oppose it with, on any level -- psychological, economic, or military. The supporters of the SDI are obviously attempting, by wishful thinking, to assuage themselves about their opponents.

The tremendous moral effect that is exerted in the world by the Soviet peace-loving foreign policy, which has been given the name of "peace offensive," does not have to be proved. This currently is manifesting itself with particular clarity in the goodwill and attention that are shown to our country's new initiatives concerning the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons on earth by the end of this century. As for the military and economic aspects, here too the adherents of the SDI are lulling themselves with dreams that will never come true.

Even with the practical implementation of the SDI, its goals cannot be achieved in full volume.

First, in and of itself, space weapons cannot be perfect. Almost all the scientists, including the American ones, agree that the creation of a space "shield" that is absolutely impenetrable by intercontinental ballistic missiles is just as impossible as inventing a perpetual motion machine. Computations indicate that even with the most "optimistic" calculations its effectiveness, that is, its ability to intercept and destroy within a short period of time -- of the order of two minutes -- several thousand missiles that are launched both from the continents and from submarines at unknown, changing positions in the ocean (no actions at all by the system against cruise missiles or strategic bombers are provided for), does not exceed 80-90 percent. Even if it is possible to increase the impenetrability of the "shield" to a fantastic figure -- 99 percent -- then, out of 1000 intercontinental missiles, each of which carries ten nuclear warheads, 100

nuclear charges will still reach their targets. And that one percent is sufficient to deliver a strike equivalent in total capacity to the explosion of thousands of Hiroshimas. So it obviously turns out that the shield has holes in it! Consequently, a retaliatory strike at the aggressor is inevitable.

Secondly, the space system itself, despite its great cost (according to an estimate by the U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists, the total cost of the Star Wars program can reach the improbable total of \$1.2-1.5 trillion), is too complicated and vulnerable, and is, in essence, defenseless. Each of the space stations, if they are built, is a complex of systems that are closely interconnected and interaction -- for locating the target, for homing in on the target, for providing communication and control. It is a tremendous telescope in space, tremendous mirrors and radar systems, radar stations, etc., which are considerably more vulnerable than those objectives against which those weapons are directed.

In a word, the task of reinforcing security with the aid of SDI is an illusion. The countermeasures, of which one can currently envisage several dozen, can create very complicated problems for the country which, after unleashing a Star War, would want to hide behind the "star shield."

What, then, can the possible response be? Specialists can already mention several possible responses.

First, it could be the creation [sozdaniye] of an analogous opposing system. That path is expensive, but, most important, it is relatively ineffective, because, according to computations by sciences, an insignificant amount -- just 0.1 percent -- of the fire power of this kind of system is sufficient to destroy in a single strike its twin, the analogous system on the opposing side.

Furthermore, it is the intensification and improvement of the existing strategic forces, in order to achieve the maximum reduction of the effectiveness of the space weapons being developed in the United States.

Another path is the creation [sozdaniye] of measures of destroying combat space stations. Taking into consideration the extreme complexity and vulnerability of such stations, the counteraction measures can be extremely effective, and the expenditures for them, minimal. As has been attested to by one American study, a hypothetical space station is more expensive than a small one placed on board a missile with a single warhead, which can destroy it completely, by an order of two, that is, it is 100 times more expensive. And, in essence, there is no need to destroy a space station. All that is needed is to break one of the links in the complicated chain (for example, the mirror), in order to put it out of commission.

Our country is fighting to assure that no weapons at all will be put in space. We believe that by the year 2000 it is possible to stop the arms race and to rid the planet of nuclear weapons. However, if, despite our arguments, the United States nevertheless implements the Star Wars program, then, as was emphasized by M. S. Gorbachev at a press conference in Geneva, the USSR will find a response and it "will be effective, less expensive, and can be carried out within shorter periods of time."

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ON OPPOSITION TO SDI PARTICIPATION IN FRG

Social Democrats, Greens

LD241520 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 23 Apr 86

[Text] Bonn, April 23, TASS--Spokesmen for the West German opposition parties strongly criticised the American "star wars" program and West Germany's participation in it at debates in the Bundestag today.

The Social Democrats are strongly opposed to the spread of the arms race into outer space and to any participation of Bonn in the SDI program, Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic parliamentary faction, stressed. According to him, the texts of secret agreements between the USA and West Germany on SDI and covering letters for them that were published by the West German press the other day show that they are agreements of a military character. In this way Bonn has assumed political responsibility for the consequences of the implementation of the "star wars" program and for another round of the arms race. The conclusion of agreements on participation in SDI is also economically damaging to West Germany.

Washington can demand from Bonn more restrictions on trade with socialist countries. If the Social Democrats come to power in the forthcoming elections to the Bundestag, a Social Democratic government will immediately cancel the agreements on West Germany's participation in SDI, Vogel said.

The Greens disarmament expert, H. Schuerholz, characterised the agreements as very dangerous. According to him, West German Economics Minister Martin Bangemann signed in Washington "an instrument of capitulation to the U.S. war industry." The Bundestag should cancel those agreements, he said.

SDP Presidium Statement

LD291332 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 29 Apr 86

[Text] Bonn, April 29, TASS--The Presidium of the SPD Board has strongly criticised the agreement between the FRG and the USA signed by the CDU/CSU--FDP on the participation of West German industrial firms and research institutions in the work under the "star wars" programme. By signing an agreement on SDI, the FRG Government together with Washington has taken upon itself the

responsibility for the implementation of the programme, which provides for the placing of the new type of strategic weapons into outer space, says the statement issued here by the Presidium of the SPD board. The SPD strongly condemns this step and is against the spreading of the nuclear weapons race into outer space. The agreement concluded between the FRG and the USA is detrimental to the interests of West Germany's citizens.

It is noteworthy, the statement says, that the FRG Government was trying to keep secret the contents of the agreement on the SDI. By means of that treaty the USA intends to pursue further the policy of limitation of West Germany's trade with the countries of the East, by exerting on the Federal Republic not only political, but also economic pressure. The agreement on the SDI does not ensure for the FRG, as the government was earlier trying to claim, control over the conduct of research within the framework of the United States project. Meanwhile, Washington got precisely the "lever," by means of which it intends to bring pressure to bear on the FRG Government in the implementation of the SDI project.

The project of the so-called "strategic defence initiative" of the USA, the SPD statement says, is not of a research character and does not serve towards the use of outer space with peaceful aims. The statement says that should the SPD come to power, the Social Democratic government would renounce within 3 months the SDI agreement concluded between the FRG and the USA.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ASSAILS ISRAELI-U.S. SDI AGREEMENT

Aimed at Middle East

LD080423 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 7 May 86

[Viktor Ivanov commentary]

[Text] An agreement has been signed in Washington on Israel's participation in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, the plans to militarize space. Our observer, Viktor Ivanov, comments:

Although the text of the accords has been left secret, it's quite clear what purpose it pursues. Officially, the Strategic Defense Initiative, popularly known as the star wars program, is aimed allegedly at designing a weapon capable of destroying nuclear missiles and thereby ridding the United States and its allies of a nuclear attack menace. In fact, plans to militarize space were contrived as a means to insure an overwhelming military superiority for the United States so that it would be able to dictate its terms to the rest of the world. It's from these positions that the Washington administration has been acting to involve its allies in star wars plans.

Technically, Israel's role in a gigantic space program looks miserable but its signature under the accord makes it possible for Washington to train its weaponry on a huge region of exceptional strategic and economic significance. The systems the United States plans to put in space actually provide for a mighty strike potential to wipe out a target in any part of the world, the Middle East included, within seconds. Washington brings to fruition its long-standing dream of policing whole continents with advanced weapons, including lasers, nuclear reactors and the like. The danger of such plans is apparent in the overall context of American policy in the Middle East and around it. The core of this line is neoglobalism, a concept that presupposes the use of armed force where developments are in discord with Washington's scenario. The American strikes on Lebanon and Libya have inflicted heavy civilian casualties. What with the appearance of space weapons, the price the civilians will have to pay for reasserting American vital interests may prove much greater. The danger of bloodshed on a wider scale as a result of American armed force looks more ominous in the light of the threat the United States addressed to Syria, Iran and the neighboring countries.

As for Israel, its objectives are clear. With patronage and military cover from space and from its senior ally, it intends to continue the policy of conquest and annexation towards its neighbors. The idea, as you can see, is not to prepare for defense against an imaginary Soviet attack, but to pursue even more aggressive aspirations of their strategic allies in the Middle East. This as a prospect has definitely tempted Washington and Tel Aviv, it's been arousing quite opposite feelings among ordinary Americans and Israelis.

'Rearm Israel Aggressors'

LD091013 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1530 GMT 8 May 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The United States and Israel have signed an official document under which the Zionist state joins the implementation of Washington's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Thus, the distinguished relations between Israel and the United States take on a new phase of development, creating yet another aspect of strategic cooperation between U.S. imperialism and Zionism. What are the results that might ensue from the new U.S.-Israeli deal?

Of course, it would not be difficult to surmise the political consequences. The growing technical and military cooperation between Washington and Tel Aviv will provide the Zionists with the new impetus to practice their aggressive expansionist policy. In the Zionists joining the star wars adventure, they hope that U.S. support for the various Israeli plots in the Middle East will become clearer. Hence, it is evident that the Arabs should expect a rigidity in the attitude of Israeli ruling circles, particularly with regard to the occupied Arab territories. There are few who still doubt that this will ultimately increase tension.

There is yet another aspect to this matter, namely, the military-strategic aspect. The United States, which is seeking to impose its hegemony on this part of the world, feels that the fastest way to achieve their goal lies in turning its closest ally into a regional big power and a nuclear missile center. Drawing Israel into manufacturing various types of new combat systems is precisely the first step on this road. The United States wants, under the guise of the SDI to rearm the Israeli aggressors and place more sophisticated means of annihilation in their hands. The experts admit that Reagan's SDI begins with organizing the management of the battle systems and the development of offensive aircraft systems.

Joint work with the United States within the framework of star wars will enable Israel to considerably increase its capability for aggression. The armed air forces essentially form the abscissa of this capability.

Israeli, which the Pentagon has always considered a U.S. bridgehead for expansion in the Middle East, is now considered a natural base for space missile weapons and a center for its management. For this reason, full installations will be erected in Israel, such as a laser monitoring station in the outskirts of Jerusalem.

Such a weapon can be used not only against targets in space but also against ground targets. The INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE has written that the laser weapon now being produced within the framework of the SDI can easily be used to destroy enemy cities and not only to provide protection from enemy missiles.

It is no secret that the Pentagon considers the socialist countries the arch-enemy of U.S. world domination plans. After the U.S. piratical attack on Libya, however, there can be absolutely no doubt that the United States was fully capable of selecting any point in the Arab world as a target for a space strike when its political ambitions demand it. The choice of target could be influenced by the Israeli extremists under whose disposal the Pentagon has been placing its satellites and electronic spying devices.

Thus, the U.S.-Israeli deal establishes the start of a new campaign for the intimidation of the Arab peoples. These peoples, however, have had numerous opportunities to realize that their collective action and their determination to defend their dignity and national sovereignty can undermine all designs by the aggressors and those practicing policies of intimidation and terrorization.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CRITICIZES JAPANESE DEFENSE MINISTER ON SDI

LD142023 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 14 May 86

["What Does Koichi Kato Advocate?"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, May 14, TASS--TASS Political News Analyst Askold Biryukov writes: Chief of the Japan Defence Agency Koichi Kato has decided to make his contribution to Japan's drawing to the American star wars programme. Speaking at a meeting of government members considering the question of Japan's participation in Washington's Strategic Defence Initiative, he said that Japan's participation in SDI is at the "research stage" of the programme "will not be incompatible with its defence questions of defence."

This bold statement by the chief of the Japan Defence Agency could well be explained, since he conducts a course of all-round cooperation with the Pentagon. It is not accidental that the Japanese news agency KYODO TSUSHIN assessed it as "the latest definite indication" to Japan's readiness to participate in SDI. It is to be noted that five conferee members of the government, which asserts that it abides, as before, by "the cautious stand" in that issue, actually associated themselves with Koichi Kato's statement. They agreed that SDI is allegedly a transition from the "guaranteed mutual destruction" strategy to the "guaranteed mutual survival" strategy, since, as the U.S. explains, this is a "defensive" programme. They also asserted that Japan will allegedly not exceed the framework of its defence policy, if it participates in SDI "research works."

It is strange to hear such words uttered by responsible leaders. They are not that naive not to know the aim of the star wars programme. No matter how hard they tried to present the programme as "defensive," it has the aim to establish an "impenetrable shield" of anti-missile defence and acquire the first nuclear strike potential so that to have a possibility of unleashing an aggression with the use of nuclear weapons "with impunity." Is not this the meaning of pronouncements by the star wars project Director General James Abrahamson who pictures in public how space weapons will hit the enemy on earth? And what about the pronouncement by his associate Air Force Colonel George Hess on the "need" for the U.S. Armed Forces to put forward from their ranks space Admiral Nelsons and Field Marshal Rommels?

The SDI's aggressive essence is seen from these revelations (and these could be continued). Those who are engaged in its realisation, least of all think of "mutual guaranteed survival." The star wars programme with the "space shield" having been announced by its kernal, does not at all abolish the "nuclear sword," being forged by the USA, but envisages its perfection. This is exactly what is being done in Nevada, where nuclear tests are continuing. This weapon threatens to become so much sophisticated that adoption of decisions on its use will wholly rest with automatic machines and mankind will find itself a hostage of computers. The "Challenger" disaster, American missile accidents, following one after another, show what this might lead to. Should there appear even through a single fault in the Washington-deployed anti-missile defence system with space-based elements, and the irreparable will happen.

Canadian scientist from Victoria University Professor D. Parnas, who refused to continue working for the star wars programme, stated in Australia that all this programme is a grandiose deception and every person linked with it knows this full well. The star wars system, he said, will only assist unleashing of a nuclear war, but by no means will help avert it.

To declare in SDI support, to justify SDI participation with "defence" references, means to mislead the public, to assist escalation of the nuclear arms race to space proportions, to heighten the threat of a nuclear war.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1370

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ISRAEL'S MOSHE ARENS URGES JAPAN'S SDI PARTICIPATION

OW131159 Tokyo KYODO in English 1145 GMT 13 May 86

[Text] Tokyo, 14 May (KYODO)--Moshe Arens, Israeli minister without portfolio and former defense minister in 1983, said here Tuesday that after his talks with Japanese officials he hopes to change Japanese views on Middle East matters. "We do not share identical opinions and I believe that this is the result of a difference in perception--a gap between views from Tokyo and from Jerusalem," he said.

In his meetings with Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe; Director General of the Defense Agency Koichi Kato; Yohei Kono, director general of the Science and Technology Agency, and other officials, Arens said, he explained Israeli attitudes toward Middle East problems. He hopes for better cooperation between the two countries.

Declining to say exactly what was discussed with the Japanese officials, he only disclosed that the discussions were satisfactory. "The two nations are democratic and follow the same principles--which could lead to further strengthening of technical, cultural and industrial ties," he said.

He also added that Japan's role as a third party mediator between Middle Eastern countries will not bring concrete solutions because ultimate understanding can only be achieved through direct talks between the Middle Eastern countries involved. "This was the way Egypt signed a peace pact with Israel when President Anwar al-Sadat came to Israel and also Jordan had direct negotiations with us," he said.

Asked to comment on when Israel will withdraw from the West Bank area it occupies in Lebanon, Arens said Israel will follow the proposals of the Camp David meeting. "It was decided that the final status will be negotiated between Israel and Jordan and Egypt and so when the time comes we will be ready to meet," he said.

"There is a difference of opinions among the Israelis," he admitted. "Some believe that we must be ready to withdraw, but others including myself are of the view that since this area is in the heart of Israel, if we give it up our own security will be threatened," he explained.

Arens said that Israel is pleased with the anti-terrorist measures taken at the Tokyo summit. "It shows that the Western world is determined to put a stop to these violent acts," he added.

Israel has signed an agreement with the United States confirming its participation in the SDI program. "We believe that the SDI program will improve the Western world security strategies," he said. In a few months' time Israel will decide on exactly what role it should play.

/9604

CSO: 5160/089

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NTT WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN SDI RESEARCH

OW171119 Tokyo KYODO in English 1106 GMT 17 May 86

[Text] Tokyo, May 17 KYODO -- Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corp. (NTT) said Saturday it is willing to participate in research for the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) if the government gives its approval. NTT is the first Japanese private firm to express a desire to take part in the project.

Makoto Watanabe, executive director of the company, participated in a Japanese survey mission sent to the United States in late March through mid-April. Company officials said NTT is still 100 percent-owned by the government despite its privatization and its participation in the space-based antimissile project -- known as "star wars" -- would have to be approved by the government.

The United States has shown strong interest in NTT's high technology, including semiconductor know-how, the official said. Its participation in the SDI research work would help the company further promote technological developments in the future, they said. Other private firms, including Mitsubishi Electric Co., NEC and Toshiba Corp., are studying the possibility of their participation in the research.

NEC, Hitachi Ltd. and Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd. are believed certain to take part.

/9274

CSO: 5260/090

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

USSR COSMONAUT ON SDI--New York, 10 May (TASS)--Georgiy Grechko, USSR pilot cosmonaut, characterized the sinister "star wars" plans being pursued by the U.S. administration as a "lethal threat to mankind." At a news conference which took place here, he stressed that the appearance of weapons in outer space would inevitably lead to a completely out of control arms race. Any reckless political action or a computer mistake would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. A warning in this respect is the recent "Challenger" disaster, the Soviet cosmonaut emphasized. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2113 GMT 9 May 86 LD] /8918

CSO: 5200/1370

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: ALLIES HAVE NO VETO OVER LAUNCH OF U.S. EUROMISSILES

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 15, 8 Apr 86 p 8

[Answer by A. Oganesyan to reader's letter]

[Text] Certain countries in Western Europe have agreed to having American Pershings and cruise missiles deployed on their territory. Did those countries also receive the right to veto the launching of those missiles? -- S. Glushkov, Kazan.

Recently members of the Danish parliament directed a similar question to the highest NATO officials. They asked that question after the Danish government had given its consent to the deployment of American cruise missiles in that country. However, the Danish legislators did not receive a reply to the question that interested them. NATO chief, Lord Carrington, together with the commander in chief of the NATO troops in Europe, American General B. Rogers, refused to let the Danish parliament in on the secrets of the subordination of the American medium-range missiles.

And yet Denmark, as is well known, is one of the West European countries that have accepted the Pentagon's "Greek gift." Therefore, in order to reply to the question of to whom, in actuality, the American Pershings and Tomahawks are subordinate, one can refer to the experience of other countries, for example, England and West Germany.

Let us begin by stating that in mid-November 1983, the then Minister of Defense of Great Britain, M. Hazeltine, was caught completely unaware when he learned that the first consignments of "cruise missiles" had begun arriving in the country on board U.S. Air Force Galaxy aircraft. His perplexity revealed a very simple fact: even the most highly placed members of the British cabinet were not privy to all the secrets pertaining to the use, movement, and deployment schedule for American missiles in Europe.

We might recall that Great Britain became the first country to give its consent to the deployment of American medium-range missiles. But even that emphasized loyalty of London, as one can see, was not rewarded by Washington's trust. Noisy debates in the British Parliament concerning the need for dual control, or, as they said there, "a double key," remained debates. But General Rogers stated outright that, in the event of an armed conflict in

Western Europe, there must be no delays in the use of the nuclear missiles deployed in the "old world."

Hence it is obvious that all the main control functions at the bases where American missiles are deployed are exclusively in the hands of the Pentagon officials. The governments of the Western European countries cannot carry out even an elementary inspection of the condition of the Americans' death-dealing cargo on European land. Incidentally, that was also confirmed by an incident at the American base near Heilbronn, in West Germany, where a Pershing-2 missile caught on fire, causing a threat of the mass nuclear destruction of the civilian population of West Germany. Another telling situation also occurred in West Germany. During a routine training exercise, when American soldiers were practicing the redeployment of missiles, one of them, as a result of an automobile accident, proved to be in danger of exploding. The accident scene was immediately cordoned off by American military men, and not a single representative of the West German authorities was allowed to investigate the situation.

As for the direct right to "press the button," it is the exclusive privilege of the representatives of the U.S. military command element. A U.S. congressional commission admitted that even the so-called "independent" nuclear forces of England and France are actually subordinate to the U.S. Strategic Air Command, which establishes for them the specific targets on the territory of the USSR and its allies. What, then, can be said about the Pershings and Tomahawks whose control panels are the responsibility of American military men?

In an interview given to the newspaper MATIN in 1983, M. Hazeltine admitted that London could not prevent the launching of those missiles if such a decision had been made in Washington. And a year later, the American base was visited by a delegation of members of Parliament from the Labour Party. "Everything that we saw," Member of Parliament R. Clay, in particular, stated, "graphically showed that England has absolutely no right of veto against the launching of the nuclear missiles." The same thing can be said about Denmark or any other country where the American Pershings and Tomahawks are deployed.

5075
CSO: 5000/1352

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

DUTCH SOCIALIST OPPOSES PRODUCTION OF CHEMICAL ARMS

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 21 Apr 86 p 8

[Article by Piet Dankert, member of the Socialist faction of the European Parliament: "Will Europe Yield To Chemical Weapons?"]

[Text] "Success in banning chemical weapons will depend on the strength of the American negotiating position. This, in turn, depends on the willingness of Congress to approve the administration's request for new binary chemical weapons. The intention of these weapons is not to attempt to match a capacity like the Soviet Union's, but they will form a barrier against the Soviet Union's massive and growing chemical threat towards Europe, and spur that country to seriously negotiate on the comprehensive and verifiable ban that we have proposed." These words of Kenneth Adelman, the director of the American government's policy towards chemical weapons. It is the zero-option, conceived in connection with the Pershing and Cruise missiles, in new clothes.

Last year, the American Congress bowed to President Reagan, after several years of fanatical resistance by the House of Representatives. Under a number of conditions, the production of chemical weapons may soon be started. One of the conditions is that NATO genuinely not be against this. The discussion within NATO has begun. The DPC [Defence Planning Committee] has already been talking, on an ambassadorial level, about the NATO force goals for some time. The force goals will be set, at the latest, at the DPC meeting of 21 to 23 May. When that happens, the allies still will not have made any legally binding agreement, but politically they will be able to claim the approved force goals, both within NATO and at home. It looks like the binary chemical weapons will belong, at the end of May, to the obligations that can be claimed of NATO members. If this is possible, then Congress's condition is fulfilled and production can be started within a relatively short time.

The House of Representatives had initially attached very stringent conditions to starting production of the binary weapons. After the negotiations between the House and the Senate, little remained of the harshness of these conditions, thanks in part to the active efforts of the administration. The House had insisted that NATO would have to formally request the chemical weapons. The spiritual father of that amendment, democrat John Spratt, said in September 1985 "that he now was accepting the administration's view, but that a formal request by NATO should not be demanded since this would lead to political

unrest in Europe." Another of the House's conditions, that "the NATO countries declare themselves ready to accept them on whosoever territory the new weapons might be stored", was watered down to "the funds for the construction of components of binary weapons would not be delivered until the President had informed Congress that he had a plan for moving the weapons from their storage places to Europe in the event of a crisis and that the NATO allies had been consulted concerning that plan." I assume, rather I know for certain, that this consultation consists of nothing more than the allies' passive acceptance of the binary weapons as a force goal. In this way, the misery of neutron bombs can be prevented.

Both West German Chancellor Kohl and Prime Minister Lubbers have quite a bit of room to act, if nothing goes wrong. According to the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, the former held the opposition off with the news that no permission was being asked for storage in the Federal Republic and that the NATO discussion was relevant exclusively in crisis situations. At the "Day of Democracy" in Amsterdam, Prime Minister Lubbers answered the question of whether the Netherlands would permit chemical weapons on its territory in crisis situations with a frank "no." Neither Kohl nor Lubbers lied. They succeeded equally in diverting attention from the question that was actually posed them, or they answered it by not taking a position, in a manner that was positive for Reagan.

Congress' condition for the production of binary weapons is that the NATO allies be consulted. By not contesting the inclusion, advocated by the United States, of binary weapons in the NATO force goals, the condition set by Congress has been fulfilled, and so the production process can begin. For this, and not for storage, whether in time of crisis or not, European cooperation is demanded. Both Kohl and Lubbers have given no explanations that indicate they will, actively or passively, refuse cooperation.

"Chemical weapons must be banned," say the Americans. "In order to bring the Russians around to this, we are going to start producing them." If you produce them, then they must serve a purpose. For this, too, the CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY WEEKLY REPORT gives a decisive answer. In the American defense budget for 1987, 101 million dollars are included for the artillery shell for the 155mm howitzer and 57 million dollars for the production of a binary bomb. NATO's efforts are directed towards increasing the range of the 155mm and giving this cannon system a nuclear task, where it does not already have one.

It seems, then, that the Americans have clear plans for chemical weapons. It is a matter, among other things, of replacing the old stockpiles with new ones. The old weapons are still capable of being effectively deployed. A government expert was recently cited in JANE DEFENCE WEEKLY as having said that one can better react to a Soviet nuclear first strike with chemical weapons than with weapons from NATO's nuclear force. Howitzers with a longer range and fighter-bombers could do an excellent job of that in the central sector of Europe. Whether this is the way things should be is another question altogether. That, with such a development, a complete ban on chemical weapons will come closer seems doubtful.

12507/12795
CSO: 5200/2680

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CPSU'S YELTSIN COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV 18 APRIL PROPOSAL

Delegation Arrives in Bonn

LD072049 Moscow TASS in Russian 1520 GMT 7 May 86

[Excerpts] Bonn May 7 TASS--The CPSU delegation headed by Alternate Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and First Secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU Boris Yeltsin, that took part in the Eighth Congress of the German Communist Party, has arrived in Bonn.

B. Yeltsin was received by Philipp Jenninger, President of the Bundestag. In the course of their conversation, they discussed the initiatives of the USSR on reducing various types of armaments and on setting up of zones in Europe free of chemical weapons. They also discussed their attitudes toward SDI, questions of improving the flow of information, and technical cooperation.

The CPSU delegation had a meeting with the leaders of the FRG democratic organization "Peace List," which will be putting up candidates in next year's Bundestag elections. The "Peace List" leaders described the constant struggle of the antiwar forces against turning the territory of the FRG into a launching pad for U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles, the struggle for the withdrawal of the nuclear missiles already deployed against the participation of the FRG in implementing the ominous U.S. star wars program.

DIE ZEIT Interviews Yeltsin

DW071101 Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 9 May 86 pp 5-6

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Moscow Party chief, by correspondent Christian Schmidt-Haeuer; date and place not given]

[Excerpt] ZEIT: After your speech at the DKP Congress, the impression was created that dark clouds have again appeared over East-West relations. Your conclusion was: The more proposals the Soviet Union makes, the more stubbornly they will be rejected. You said that the Bonn government just reflects Washington's two faces. After recent developments do you see a real chance at all to develop a "common European house?"

Yeltsin: As to the assessment of the tense situation, I believe that assessment is shared by all. After the summit meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan, hopes were higher, more optimistic in the whole world than was realistic. We hope that a certain change will take place in Washington's policy. We believe that a real fundamental basis has been created to achieve concrete results that will be understandable for the people. In Vienna, for example, negotiations have been taking place for many years, and it is obvious that not everyone understands the technical details of the negotiations.

However, we have submitted a very clear and distinct program, which is understandable to all people: First, a gradual elimination of all nuclear weapons through the year 2000. Second, we propose, even now, to discontinue nuclear tests. We declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. We extended that moratorium once, then we extended it a second time.

Even now we are not in a hurry to resume testing, although 8 months have since elapsed. As you know, the weapons are getting old. So actually they ought to be tested -- and yet we are not in a hurry to resume testing.

Third: We have also submitted proposals for the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe. However, to these three proposals we have not even gotten a "no" as an answer. Even the possibility of sitting down at the negotiating table is being ignored. Therefore, it would be wrong to speak of decreased tension or some sort of an improved situation now.

Naturally, I do not want to dramatize the situation by saying that there are clouds that cannot be penetrated. I believe that even greater efforts and an even greater zeal are necessary to sit down at the negotiating table and to agree. I would like to point out that it would be most important to abolish nuclear weapons. We have submitted that program in stages. We have said very clearly that it should be implemented as far as the Ural Mountains under international control. We formulated it that way for the first time, and for us it is a basic, serious problem. Yet, we said quite frankly and clearly: under international control as far as the Urals.

ZEIT: Many European government representatives approach the proposals of the Soviet Union most open-mindedly. However, they say that the Soviet negotiators in Geneva and Vienna are not offering explanatory details to Gorbachev's proposals, and that they do not have answers to questions from Western negotiating partners.

Yeltsin: First, our basic approach to these problems has been outlined. We would like to hear a basically positive position, positive answers, from the West European governments and from the United States. In the case of positive reaction, further proposals are being worked out now and outlined. However, it would probably be advisable to work the concrete proposals out together and mutually. On the other hand, however, I can say that our representatives in the negotiations are not yet fully equipped with details -- because the details are being determined. You must understand: A basically new proposal is involved that must be worked out in detail. I believe that representatives of our commissions and correspondents have not yet been to some regions of the territory reaching to the Urals. If we now allow representatives of an international control commission to go there, we must very clearly stipulate that information is to be mutual, not a one-sided affair up to the Urals, but adequately extended, including to Western Europe. By the way, our representatives have begun to provide explanations. It is not true that they have completely rejected explaining anything -- although the explanations are not complete.

ZEIT: How do you want to win France over to the new conventional disarmament plans? What will become of the Vienna MBFR round, which has thus far been limited to the narrow central European troop reduction area without including "tactical aviation forces?" Is there supposed to be a new conference level?

Yeltsin: That problem has not yet been solved organizationally as to where and in what forum -- should it be organized in Vienna or in some other place? However, the foundation is basically new. Tactical nuclear weapons are also involved. We envisaged including France also. It means initiating the process in all of Europe -- Europe without weapons, dismantling of conventional weaponry in all of Europe. However, so far we have nobody to sit down with at the table and negotiate.

So far, vague opinion has been forthcoming but without rejecting the proposal. It comes from France, and in a certain, nuclear way from England. The FRG also has not simply discarded the idea. However, we do not see a positive reaction either. Our proposal needs a concrete answer. If one agrees in principle to the idea, we can discuss the place, the principle, and so on. However, why should one side lay its cards on the table while the other does not?

ZEIT: At times rumors made the rounds that General Secretary Gorbachev might visit the Federal Republic before the end of the year...

Yeltsin: Well, the probability is very small, less than small. The issue is not being discussed in our country. I take part in discussions on such matters. Such rumors are also disseminated with a purpose.

ZEIT: The new CPSU party program defines "peaceful coexistence" as an absolute value and not as "a specific form of class struggle," as it had been called before. According to the party congress findings, "an antagonistic yet mutually dependent and multi-fariously integrated world" is taking shape. Suppose it were possible to clear away the smoke of the acute crises and catastrophes. Does the Soviet Union see an open horizon between the two systems?

Yeltsin: No doubt about it -- you can neither live nor work without hope -- politicians least of all. We are living with the hope that, given certain other conditions, a possibility will emerge of reaching a consensus, agreements, with other leading personages. Let me cite just one example: According to our program, and in keeping with the main guidelines of socioeconomic development, it is intended in our country in the next 15 years to create an economic potential that will correspond to the potential hitherto created in all the years of Soviet power.

If the arms race and the arms buildup are stepped up any further, it will be a heavy blow to implementing that program, because the program is difficult and complicated. We plan to increase labor productivity 2 and 1/2 times, the volume of industrial production is to be expanded 2 to 2 1/2 times. Gigantic investments, gigantic expenditures are required. What if, in addition, we have to compete in the field of nuclear and conventional weapons: After all, we cannot lag behind; you must appreciate that. By now plans have emerged to develop a European SDI program. The FRG and France intend to participate in it. In that case we are forced, of course, to engage institutes and experts of our own for the purpose of neutralizing that development.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1376

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: FURTHER COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV 18 APRIL PROPOSAL

WEU Session

LD301613 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 30 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS--Follows commentary by Leonid Ponomarev, TASS political news analyst:

The council of the West-European Union (WEU) at the level of foreign and defence ministers of the seven member countries--the FRG, France, Britain, the Netherlands, Italy, Belgium and Luxembourg--is currently in session in Venice.

Judging by western press reports, the participants in the session have examined the new package of the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives on the limitation of the conventional forces and arms of the two opposing blocs and limitation of their military activity in the zone from the Atlantic to the Urals.

These fresh Soviet proposals are evidence of the USSR's wish to settle a major problem in Europe, precisely to reduce military confrontation in the continent of powerful armed forces equipped with conventional weapons.

It would be natural to expect the participants in the session to approach the fresh Soviet proposals seriously. At least for the simple reason that no security problems in Europe can be resolved without the Soviet Union's participation, even less so in defiance of the security interests of the USSR itself and of its allies.

The EEC ministers, who came together in Venice, were in a hurry to reject the Soviet initiatives, thus demonstrating that both they and the NATO bloc as a whole have no stake in a real cut in the conventional weapons, in lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe. Nevertheless they are continuing their demagogic talk of the wish to disarmament, deceive the public of their countries by the promises to "reach agreement" with the USSR.

It shall be reminded that there are no "traps" in the Soviet proposals. They are simple and logical. They are aimed at reaching agreement on a considerable cut in all components of the ground forces and the tactical airforce

of the European countries and the forces of the USA and Canada deployed in Europe. The reductions should be carried out on a stage-by-stage basis, according to an agreed schedule and with a permanent preservation of the existing balance in the conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe without detriment to anybody's security.

The ultimate result should be a lowering of the level of military confrontation in Europe. Moreover, along with the conventional weapons, the USSR also proposes a cut in tactical nuclear weapons. Reliable verification is envisaged, up to international forms of verification, including, if necessary, on-site inspection, on which the western side, to be more precise Washington, insists.

Such is the new package of proposals on a cut in the conventional weapons in Europe proposed by the Soviet Union. Yet they in the west hold a different stand. The leaders of NATO, above all of the USA, would like to see solely unilateral actions of the USSR in the field of disarmament, but themselves far from reducing, would, on the contrary, further build up their military potential under the pretext of a "modernization," elimination of the "windows of vulnerability" and other inventions. Nothing will, naturally, come of it, as disarmament is a two-way street. And the rules of traffic in that street are the same to all.

Timing Explained

WA081509 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 18, 4 May 86 p 7

[Commentary by Lev Semeiko]

[Text] Why has the new Soviet initiative on the reduction of armaments and armed forces in Europe appeared precisely now?

There are several reasons and all of them are interconnected, even though not all of them surfaced just now. Firstly, the acuity and the scope of the military confrontation in Europe, under which the threat of both a "conventional" and a nuclear clash could reach its apogee.

Secondly, it is the "Vienna dead-end" on the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments in central Europe. It has been dragging along for 13 years already and has become a nominal notion. The new Soviet initiative in its greater--all-European handling of the question--is aimed at activating the reduction of the military capability of the sides in central Europe, at the main point of their confrontation.

Thirdly, it is the idea, put forward in the West, about the "impossibility" of nuclear disarmament in conditions of Soviet "superiority" in conventional armaments. This idea has become essentially, one of the main after the USSR put forward its package of foreign policy initiatives on January 15 this year (their main aim is to rid Europe completely of nuclear weapons by 2000). The West has announced that without nuclear weapons Western Europe, allegedly, would become "helpless in the face of aggression from the East". The latest USSR initiative is aimed at supplementing and expanding the provisions in the Soviet programme of disarmament of January 15, which deal with conventional arms. The main idea is to remove the false fears of the West in regard to the "aggressiveness" of the USSR.

Lastly, one more meeting of the delegates from the states-participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is to be held in Vienna in autumn. This meeting must contribute heavily to the improvement of the political climate and to the rebirth of detente in Europe and the world over, to the agreeing upon new major steps on the lowering of the level of the military confrontation in Europe and to the expansion of cooperation among the European states. The new Soviet initiative is a practical contribution to the preparations for this meeting.

And on the whole, what is meant is the logical continuation of the general Soviet line--to reduce step by step and, in the long run, to eliminate the threat of not only a nuclear but also a conventional war. Earlier, to remind the reader, the USSR offered to sign a non-aggression pact and a pact on non-use first of nuclear and conventional weapons by participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The USSR also proposed to reduce mutually the military activities of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, and to dissolve completely their military organizations. It also proposed different plan for freezing and for stage-by-stage reduction of troops and armaments in central Europe. Moreover, the USSR had also demonstrated unilateral examples in the reduction of its own relevant forces.

Now a new step is being proposed, which is of paramount importance and much more significant than the central European proposition. And, indeed, if confronting each other in central Europe are Armed Forces of the two blocs numbering nearly a million each, then in Europe as a whole there are three-million-strong groups, equipped with modern tanks, aircraft, different types of missiles and other weapons. If 19 states are taking part in the newly proposed negotiations. If at the Vienna talks the discussion now centres on, essentially, a symbolical reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops in Central Europe (all together, slightly more than 15,000 servicemen), the USSR now is proposing a considerable reduction of armed forces on an all-European basis.

Let's imagine for a moment that the world has been freed of nuclear weapons, and only conventional arms, but of much greater capacity than during World War II, are left. The total fire power of the USA's conventional weapons has increased by 200 times already according to Western experts. "Conventional" systems that are practically comparable in their destructive capacity with low-yield nuclear weapons have been elaborated. The prospects will be even more ominous if the development of non-nuclear arms, based on new physical properties and also comparable with mass-annihilation weapons, is not averted.

Is this a threat to universal security? Yes! And it is all the greater if we take into account Caspar Weinberger's recent declaration that nuclear weapons can be liquidated only when non-nuclear weapons have been developed that can replace them.

As for the U.S. approach to the reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons, then its arguments are as follows: "Nuclear reductions alone, particularly in the manner now proposed by the Soviet Union, are not enough to ensure a more secure peace." That's what Paul Nitze maintains. Now the USSR is supplementing its proposals on nuclear disarmament with the initiative on disarmament in the field of conventional weapons. Doesn't this conform to the wishes of the U.S. side? But still Weinberger, the U.S. defense secretary, immediately declared that the April 18 USSR proposals should be treated "with caution". Such a stand can block the political solution of the transfer from the present state of equal danger to the state of equal security at the lowest possible levels of military confrontation. The only alternative to such a transfer can be a rise in these levels, and unpredictable consequences.

GDR, CSSR Backing

FM090928 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 May 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS reports under the general headline "Most Important Task"]

[Text] Berlin, 6 May — Safeguarding peace is the most important task of the present day, and the GDR fully supports the USSR's constructive proposals aimed at completely ridding the planet of nuclear weapons before the year 2000 and the initiatives put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 11th SED Congress. This has been stated here by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council.

The policy of the USSR, the GDR, and the other socialist countries, he noted, is evidence of their sense of high responsibility for the fate of mankind. Western ruling circles use every means to try to maintain international tension and to aggravate confrontation as much as possible by fanning malicious anti-Soviet propaganda. All states need peace. That is why the Soviet Union's peace-loving proposals have found such a positive and broad response on all continents.

Berlin, 6 May — The CSSR fully supports the Soviet peace program aimed at freeing mankind from the threat of war and eliminating the arsenals of nuclear weapons even before the end of this century, B. Chnoupek, CSSR foreign minister, stated in an interview in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND.

The Soviet Union's constructive initiatives also envisage a considerable reduction of conventional armaments in central Europe and demonstrate a desire to create a collective international security system. The USSR's peace-loving policy convincingly repudiates the false claims of Western politicians and the mass media that the Soviet Union is striving to attain military superiority. On the contrary, it opposes the creation of new types of armaments. The implementation of the Soviet proposals would lead to the reduction of tension in Europe and would have a beneficial effect on international relations and on the entire course of the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

The question now, the minister continued, is to create the kind of political climate which would promote the development of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems. That is the aim of the GDR and CSSR Governments' joint initiatives on creating a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. That would help to considerably reduce the level of military confrontation and promote the strengthening of confidence and international security. It is this trend in international politics which meets the European peoples' vital interests and finds the broadest support among the peace-loving people of the world, B. Chnoupek pointed out.

CSCE Madrid Meeting

LD091259 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Madrid May 8 TASS -- TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov reports:

A fruitful, constructive exchange of opinions on matters of disarmament, economic and cultural cooperation in Europe was held during the international "round table" conference held at the UNESCO club in Madrid. Taking part in its work were representatives of the peace committees and associations for European Security and Cooperation of Spain, the Soviet Union, Belgium, Hungary and Italy. The USSR was represented by a delegation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

The international "round table" meeting made it possible to hold useful and interesting debates between public figures of the East and West on topical problems of the present-day international situation, discuss questions of the further intensification of the struggle for peace, against the threat of war in the light of the latest Soviet proposals in disarmament, the TASS correspondent was told by representative of the Spanish Movement for Peace, Disarmament and Freedom, L. Garcia. These initiatives, she stressed, reflect the Soviet Union's sincere striving for peace. They have a concrete, purposeful and positive nature. This is not propaganda but a serious step on the road to peace, to the achievement of disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament.

Broad sections of the Spanish public, L. Garcia said, welcome and support the Soviet initiatives, linking with them their hopes for peace, for the removal of the threat of war.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1376

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER: EUROPE FACES 'CHOICE' ON ARMS CUTS

PM011623 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Apr 86 Second Edition p 3

[Captain Second Class V. Kuzar "Military Political Review": "Europe: Time, to Choose"]

[Text] World development at the present stage has come to the point where particularly crucial decisions are needed, where inaction or delay are criminal, since the fate of mankind is at stake. In these conditions the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, displaying the utmost political boldness, are doing everything to prevent the world from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe. "Our policy," M.S. Gorbachev stressed, "is dictated by concern for the survival of mankind, perhaps the only civilization in the starry expanses of the galaxy." The Soviet Union has always believed and still believes that Europe, which has made invaluable contributions to civilization, can and must play an enormous part in the struggle for a peaceful future. If it were possible to turn this continent into a continent of peace mankind's peace-loving potential would increase considerably and it would be a good example to other continents. Most important of all, it would create the basis for the establishment of general security. This is not pie in the sky. Europe has considerable prerequisites for the performance of this mission: It is the home of the policy of international detente, it has a long-established, ramified system of cooperation between West and East, and, finally, it is the common home for all the peoples who live there. Peoples who have seen more than one bloodbath in their history and who are deeply committed to lasting peace.

In an effort to prevent the flames of a new war from consuming the European home and to turn it into a center of good-neighborliness, our country is adopting concrete measures to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe. In its 15 January Statement the Soviet Union proposed the removal of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles from the entire continent on condition that the other NATO members--Britain and France--do not increase their nuclear missile potential. Now this program for ridding Europe and the entire world of nuclear weapons has been supplemented with new constructive initiatives.

Addressing the 11th SED Congress in Berlin, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev put forward some new, far-reaching proposals. The idea is to considerably reduce all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical aviation and of the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces deployed in Europe. The geographical zone of reduction would cover the entire territory of the continent--from the Atlantic to the Urals. Operational-tactical nuclear weapons would be reduced, as well as conventional armaments. There was confirmation of the Soviet Union's willingness to take a more radical step--simultaneous disbandment of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, or, for a start at least, the two alliances' military organizations.

The new Soviet proposals are a concretization and development of the USSR's comprehensive approach to the idea of complete and general disarmament as applied to the European Continent. It is no accident that they have met with widespread support among the progressive public, among all who are interested in preserving and consolidating world peace. The leaders of West European countries have been forced to acknowledge the significance of the Soviet initiatives. FRG Foreign Minister Genscher said that the USSR's proposals raise a number of questions which should not be answered by hasty polemics. According to him, "Anyone who rejects M.S. Gorbachev's new proposals jeopardizes policy in the sphere of disarmament as a whole."

The Soviet program for the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe takes the wind out of the sails of those who are trying to place more "obstacles" in the way of nuclear disarmament. As is known, the West European capitals are refusing to remove the nuclear net from the continent since it allegedly protects the Western countries from the Warsaw Pact's "superior conventional forces." The bourgeois mass media are trying to intimidate ordinary people by talking about the vast number of Soviet tanks which, they say, could reach the banks of the Rhine and the Seine in 48 hours or so, and the formidable armadas of Soviet aircraft; for the better informed they cite various "factual" data and unscrupulously manipulate the figures.

What is the actual correlation between Warsaw Pact and NATO conventional armed forces?

The number of ground forces divisions is the figure that is usually cited. It goes without saying that the figure should only include combat-ready divisions, since only they can be used to initiate hostilities without extra mobilization. In Europe, 94 NATO divisions (counting French and Spanish divisions) face 78 Warsaw Pact divisions. A fully deployed U.S. division numbers 16,000-19,000 men and a West German division has more than 20,000. But the Warsaw Pact countries' armies' divisions have a maximum of 11,000-12,000 men.

The "tank threat from the East" theory simply does not stand up to criticism. NATO currently has 17,000 tanks. There are 8,000 more (3,000 American and 5,000 West European) tanks in store in Europe. If you add up these figures,

NATO is not behind the Warsaw Pact in terms of the total number of tanks. Moreover, Western specialists admit that the North Atlantic bloc has a definite advantage in terms of the number of modern antitank facilities in service.

As for air forces, a report by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff published some years ago plainly stated that the composition of air forces in Europe remains more or less stable. NATO has a slight superiority in terms of fighter-bombers and ground-attack aircraft, but it has fewer interceptor fighters than the Warsaw Pact. As is known, there have been no sensational changes in that sphere since then.

These are the facts. They convincingly demonstrate that there is an approximate balance between NATO and Warsaw Pact general-purpose armed forces. At the same time, it should be stressed that this balance is maintained at a very high and dangerous level. In fact, there are two powerful military groupings facing one another. Their armaments are constantly being improved and are becoming more sophisticated and powerful, which is bringing these weapons closer and closer to mass destruction weapons in terms of their combat characteristics. In short, the continent has a surfeit of nuclear and conventional armaments.

There is an obvious need for immediate and fundamental measures to bring down the level of military confrontation in Europe and strengthen European security. Their urgency is emphasized by the imperial policy of the United States. Its danger to peace and to Washington's closest allies was clearly highlighted by the aggressive, piratical act against sovereign Libya. In a fit of chauvinism the U.S. Administration chose not to heed the opinion of the majority of NATO countries who objected to the use of force against Libya. Moreover, very vigorous efforts were made to involve the West Europeans in the crime.

As is known, the African continent, including, of course, Libya, which is on that continent, is not part of the NATO bloc's "zone of responsibility." But, Washington's special envoy General Walters, on his tour of European capitals on the eve of the bandit raid on Tripoli and Benghazi, placed special emphasis on Article 6 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which the Mediterranean and the countries adjoining it figure as possible areas for the use of NATO armed forces. But unbeknown to the allies, some Atlantic bodies, headed by U.S. General Rogers, supreme allied commander in Europe, were involved in planning the barbarous bombing of the Libyan cities. West Germany was drawn willy-nilly into Washington's military adventure, the paper DIE WAHRHEIT writes. After all, according to the 1982 agreements, the Bonn government is obliged to automatically back U.S. military actions and to immediately call up 90,000 reservists in the event of U.S. forces deployed in West Germany being used in them. Or take another example. As it is now becoming clear from items in the French press, the Pentagon brazenly violated the French and Spanish bans on F-111 fighter-bombers from the USAF base in Upper Heyford (Britain) overflying their territory and sent the aircraft to Libya via the Pyrenees.

Thus, Washington, in its great-power arrogance, clearly disregarded its West European partners' national interests. But there is nothing surprising in that. Preaching the notorious "Atlantic solidarity," the United States long ago turned West Europe into its own domain. The biggest overseas grouping of U.S. forces is there. It numbers almost 350,000 personnel and is equipped with the latest offensive armaments. The West European countries are crammed with U.S. nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons. But the Pentagon is continuing to fill its European depots with more and more sophisticated types of mass destruction weapons. The next on the list for shipment to the continent are the new ultramodern chemical weapons--binary weapons, which have an extremely powerful nerve-paralysis effect. The intention is that the decision to further "chemicalize" West Europe will be approved at the upcoming May NATO Council session.

The United States is doing its utmost to get West Europe to implement a "European defense initiative" (EDI), seeing it as an integral part of the "Star Wars" program. The Pentagon's interest in EDI is demonstrated by the fact that its representatives have demanded that Congress set up a special fund to finance research in the sphere of creating a European ABM system.

It should be noted that by imposing U.S. first-strike nuclear missile systems on its allies, Washington has reduced West Europe's already slim chance of curbing U.S. policy. Basically the West European NATO countries have no option but to display "solidarity," that is, unquestioning obedience to White House instructions.

"The sleep of reason brings forth monsters," the great Spanish artist and humanist Francisco Goya once said. Today the U.S. imperial policy is such a monster, the product of the recklessness and irresponsibility of the U.S. leaders and the bosses of the military industrial complex. It is dragging mankind toward a nuclear catastrophe, back into the Stone Age. This policy presents West Europe and the NATO countries with a serious choice. Passivity, not to mention connivance and complicity, threatens to disrupt international relations, with unpredictable consequences.

By putting forward a program for reducing military confrontation in Europe, the Soviet Union is appealing to human reason. The new political philosophy of peace equates the prevention of war with the survival of mankind. But the espousal of such a philosophy demands a fundamental change in the way of thinking and acting in the international arena that has existed for centuries. Today security cannot be safeguarded just by improving shield and sword, even if they are in space. And if the West European countries' governments are really concerned about the destiny of peace, then it is time they switched from words to actions--actions proposed by the Soviet Union in its initiatives on reducing armaments in Europe. The security of each individual state directly depends on the security of all. Reason must prevail.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1369

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS ON MAY MBFR SESSION

Soviet Delegation Arrives

LD141209 Moscow TASS in English 1155 GMT 14 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 14 TASS--A Soviet delegation led by Valerian Mikhaylov has arrived here today for the next round of talks on Mutual Reductions of the Armed Forces and Armaments in central Europe.

GDR Delegate Speaks

LD151343 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 15 TASS -- TASS correspondent Anatoliy Tyupayev reports: Another round of negotiations on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe has opened here today. Andre Wieland, head of the GDR's delegation, spoke on behalf of the socialist countries. He stressed profound interest of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in stopping the arms race and in disarmament. In this context A. Wieland called attention of negotiators to the new Soviet proposal on a considerable reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces of all the European states, as well as relevant forces of the USA and Canada deployed in Europe.

We are sure, said the GDR's delegation head, that this new initiative will give a required impetus to the Vienna negotiations. The discussion of the question on reducing conventional arms and armed forces on all-European scale does not dim the socialist countries' interest in achieving positive results at the Vienna talks. Achievement of mutually acceptable understanding in Vienna could also contribute to implementing the Soviet proposals on an all-European scale. The socialist countries' proposals of last February 20, A. Wieland noted, are a realistic basis for achieving understanding in Vienna.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1369

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

WESTERN CLAIMS OF PACT SUPERIORITY DISPUTED

LD171911 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German 2030 GMT 16 Mar 86

[Colonel Dmitriy Leonidon commentary, in Russian fading into superimposed German translation]

[Text] The prospect of renouncing their nuclear strategy in the event of the implementation of the gradual disarmament program proposed by the Soviet Union is clearly a headache for certain circles of NATO. This is shown by the emergence of suppositions and unfounded assertions that the Warsaw Pact would allegedly have a significant lead in armaments in the event of the liquidation of the nuclear weapon, and that West Europe would be subjected to danger allegedly on the part of the superior Soviet conventional armed forces.

What can be said about this? It is difficult to free oneself from the stereotype, which has been intentionally created for decades, of a Soviet military threat. The lying fairy tale about a superiority in conventional armaments among the socialist countries is based on a deliberately distorted picture of the balance of forces of the sides. The data on the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact are made too high for this purpose, and at the same time, the data about the NATO troops are reduced.

An objective evaluation of the balance in conventional forces produces a completely different picture. Above all, this pertains to the superiority of NATO in terms of combat-ready divisions. In Europe, NATO has at its disposal more than 94 combat-ready divisions, taking France and Spain into account. The Warsaw Pact has only 78 divisions. There are also differences. Thus, the number of deployed U.S. divisions amounts to 16-19,000, and the divisions of the FRG 24,000; while the divisions of the armies of the Warsaw Pact amounts to 11,000 men. [All figures as heard]

As a result, NATO has a significant advantage in combat-ready divisions, and in their strength in terms of numbers. The fact should also not be overlooked that the number of inhabitants in NATO countries is 1 and 1/2 times greater than in the Warsaw Pact, that is, 620 and 375 million people. This signifies a clear majority of NATO in terms of reserve factors also.

The NATO leadership completely disregards the mobilized and human resources and the reserve formations, and excludes from its calculations the armed forces of France and Spain and also the troops which are there under the national command.

Data on the balance of armaments are also distorted. Normally in the West only those tanks are counted which, for example are subordinate to the united command of the armed forces in Europe. This is it asserted that the united armed forces of NATO in Europe have about 18,000 tanks. In reality however, they have more than 20,000 tanks at their disposal. Apart from that, concentrated in depots in Europe there are about 2,500 U.S. and 6,000 tanks from West European countries. Thus, in terms of the overall number of tanks, NATO is not lagging behind the Warsaw Pact. The sides have roughly the same amount of artillery.

An approximate balance--on the whole, this describes the relationship in terms of conventional weapons, and this is affirmed by Western sources also. In the 1985 yearbook of a London institute, "The Military Balance," it is written that in terms of conventional arms, the balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is such that it would make a military attack a most risky undertaking, since neither side has at its disposal the overall strength to guarantee a victory.

In other words, the assertions about the lack of protection of Western Europe with regard to Soviet conventional weapons are unfounded. They also do not withstand criticism because the initiatives of the USSR provide for a reduction of conventional weapons also, as well as the strengthening of confidence-building measures in the military sphere.

/12232

CSO: 1826/56

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA ON GORBACHEV BERLIN SPEECH, WESTERN RESPONSE

PM300922 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 86 First Edition p 4

[Boris Kotov "International Review"]

[Text] Loyalty to Great Traditions

Lenin and May Day. Two meaningful terms, two unfading symbols of the great proletarian traditions of struggle for mankind's social liberation, for working people's happiness, and for peace on earth, traditions of working people's international solidarity.

Last week progressive mankind celebrated on a wide scale the 116th anniversary of Vladimir Ilich Lenin's birth. Throughout the world, from our country--the motherland of the Great October Revolution--to the most distant parts of the world, many millions of people at meetings, rallies, and other mass demonstrations paid a tribute of profound respect and gratitude to the great leader of the proletariat, creator of the CPSU, and founder of the world's first socialist state.

These days working people of all countries and continents are preparing to celebrate the 100th anniversary of May Day, which occurs this year. The capitalist countries' working class is demonstrating its militancy in the struggle against exploitation and oppression by imperialist reaction.

The nationwide week of action now being held by railroad workers in France is one of the most significant demonstrations by working people in recent years. Its participants are protesting against capitalism's onslaught, which threatens massive new redundancies. In Belgium 20,000 miners demonstrated in defense of the right to work. In a trade union poll in the FRG over 7 million workers and employees opposed amendments to the labor law curtailing the right to strike. In Britain a routine Scottish trade union congress condemned the Conservative government's "catastrophic economic course." The Soviet Union and the socialist community countries are an inspiring example and guiding beacon for the oppressed of the whole world in the complex labyrinths of historical development. Lenin's dream of a time when it would be possible to "graphically prove for all to see that socialism contains colossal forces within itself and that mankind has now progressed to a new stage of development offering unusually brilliant opportunities" has now been realized.

"We sense the indissoluble inner link between these Lenin celebrations and the party's 27th congress," the report to the ceremonial meeting held in Moscow to mark Lenin's anniversary said. "As the best continuation of Leninist traditions, it displayed loyalty to all aspects of Vladimir Ilich's legacy. The main aspects are the posing of bold and revolutionary tasks on a large scale and an innovative strategy for their practical resolution." The fraternal socialist countries are following an innovative course of peace and creation. The 11th congress of the SED--a party with over 2.3 million communists in its ranks--which ended on 21 April, was a major event of international significance. It was an important milestone on the path of building a developed socialist society in the GDR--the first socialist state on German soil and an important factor for peace in Central Europe.

The results of the 11th SED Congress and the friendly meetings and conversations which the CPSU delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev had there while attending the congress confirmed with full force that the unity and cohesion between the CPSU and the SED and between the Soviet Union and the GDR will continue steadily strengthening and deepening for the good of both countries' peoples and in the interests of socialism and peace.

The Choice Facing Western Europe

It is profoundly symbolic that it was in Berlin, the capital of the GDR--now a city of peace but where 41 years ago the fascist beast which had drenched Europe in blood was slain--that our new initiatives, designed to protect the European continent from the threat of war again hanging over it, were put forward in the Soviet leader's speech at the SED Congress. These proposals follow logically from previous Soviet initiatives aimed at achieving Europe's phased liberation from nuclear weapons, and above all from medium-range nuclear means. Developing those initiatives and giving them concrete form, the new proposals offer extensive opportunities for a radical reduction in conventional armaments in Europe--from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The USSR proposes that this problem be a subject for serious talks. In the USSR's opinion, extending the scale of the question would break the deadlock which has caused the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe to drag on for so many years now. This would also demolish the far-fetched "argument" of the opponents of European disarmament, who assert that a Western Europe deprived of nuclear weapons would be extremely vulnerable and would be threatened with invasion by a fleet of Soviet tanks.

The Soviet Union also attaches great significance to ridding mankind of chemical weapons. In an attempt to accelerate the conclusion of a corresponding convention, our country submitted a number of new proposals banning chemical weapons at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva on 22 April. They would make it possible to remove the differences existing between the participants in the talks in Geneva and actively promote the formulation of a convention which

would ensure the complete and universal elimination of chemical weapons by the end of this century. The USSR appreciates all constructive initiatives in this sphere--such as the idea devised jointly by the SED and the Social Democratic Party of Germany of creating a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe--and is prepared to examine them.

A Europe without nuclear warheads and chemical means of warfare, a Europe where armed forces and armaments have been drastically reduced--that is how we would like to see our common European home. The radical proposals of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are imbued with concern for this.

What about Western Europe?

The very positive reaction of broad social and political circles is indicative of the attitudes prevailing there. "The Soviet Union's peace offensive goes on and increases"; "The USSR gives the West new signals aimed at detente"; "Soviet leader: Do not believe the fictions about the USSR's aggressiveness"; "USSR plan takes account of Western Europe's interests in the security sphere"; "The chance must not be missed, the answer must be positive and specific"; "Europe must make a choice"--these have been the kind of headline, statement, and comment filling many West European newspapers today.

But there is also something very significant missing from these responses. There is no noticeable exposition of the official position of the governments of the leading West European states.

What is happening? What this time is preventing them heeding the voice of their own peoples, who are persistently demanding the revival of the policy of detente on the continent, and openly and independently supporting the USSR's proposals in this area?

As always, the explanation is simple. A peremptory warning was immediately issued from Washington. To be specific, it came from U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. "We must treat any Russian plans regarding a change in the structure of forces in Europe with very great caution," was his categorical instruction given in an interview shown widely on television. Weinberger tried to frighten the West Europeans by alleging that the USSR had a "vast, overwhelming superiority" in armed forces and conventional armaments and intended to cause "division and disorder in NATO ranks and urged that "this be opposed." The move by the leader of the Pentagon "hawks" was just one element in Washington's current and unprecedented campaign of blackmail and threats against its disobedient "junior partners" in the Atlantic bloc, particularly those which dared not to support the U.S. aggressive military adventure in Libya. Dramatizing the situation within the Atlantic bloc, people across the ocean have been urging others "not to ruin" Atlantic solidarity and "not to spoil" NATO.

It cannot be said that this crude pressure failed to work at all, but it did not work entirely. The majority of Washington's West European allies (with the exception of London) did not give it their unconditional approval for the piratical military raid against Libya. They limited themselves to confirming the decision adopted on 14 April, that is, before the U.S. strike against Libya, on carrying out a number of "anti-Libyan sanctions" of a political and diplomatic nature. "We are extremely disappointed at the West European countries' reaction," U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary R. Armitage stated in this connection.

In this atmosphere official West European circles are in no hurry to react in any definite way to the USSR's new peace-loving proposals. The EEC Council of Ministers session held in Luxembourg recently decided, on a very flimsy pretext, not to discuss the question of East-West relations in the light of the new Soviet initiatives, a question which had initially been included on the agenda. It has been postponed to the next session.

Delays, however, are not the best method in politics. There is nowhere to hide from the grim realities of our times. Western Europe faces a choice which it will inevitably have to make. It can and must say something positive in the search for ways to strengthen security on our continent. The road of confrontation, from which Washington has so far stubbornly refused to turn back, is hopeless and dangerous.

Washington's Recklessness

Even a fleeting review of the U.S. Administration's recent actions makes it possible to see the dangerous recklessness of its policy of diktat by force and military adventures. They expose the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism's adopted doctrine of "neoglobalism," a doctrine of interference in free peoples' affairs, state terrorism, and attempts to exact social revenge on a world scale. The concrete manifestations of that doctrine are the undeclared wars against Afghanistan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Angola, and Mozambique and the direct aggression against Libya.

The fact that the bombing of Libyan cities has left the United States in deep international isolation and brought on it the anger and indignation of all honest people in the world has not cooled the hotheads across the ocean. The White House boss publicly let it be known this week that the United States may "if necessary" resort once more to a massive military strike--and not only against Libya but against other countries, too.

A number of Western countries anxiously report that at the meeting of the "big seven" capitalist states in Tokyo on 4-6 May the U.S. delegation intends to continue the operation of twisting its main allies' arms. One of the U.S. Administration head's main goals at this conference, the press points out, is to use the pretext of "combatting terrorism" to secure the agreement of its partners in the talks to joint "radical measures" against Libya, as LE MONDE says.

Another area of Washington's policy has become clear recently--namely its militarist intrigues in the Asian and Pacific region. That was where President Reagan went on 25 April. He will be making a number of stops en route for the Tokyo conference and, in particular, will be holding meetings in Indonesia with representatives of the ASEAN countries. The United States and its allies, particularly Japan, are trying to knock together a so-called "Pacific community" which, in the long term, may be transformed into a narrow regional grouping and yet another military bloc.

That is why the Soviet Government's 24 April statement warning the region's states against any actions which could worsen the political climate in that part of the world was so opportune. The statement contains extensive specific proposals aimed at consolidating and developing those positive processes which promote the search for ways to improve the international atmosphere.

And, finally--there has been yet another nuclear explosion in Nevada, whereby the United States signaled its "contribution" to the pernicious cause of the arms race and the fueling of international tension. This is an overt and cynical challenge to the peoples, who demand the imposition, following the USSR's example, of a moratorium and subsequently a complete ban on all nuclear tests! Only the distorted logic of militarists could spawn the kind of ludicrous "arguments" in justification of nuclear explosions that are now in circulation among Washington's professional propagandists. A complete and general ban on nuclear tests, as, for example, one leading staffer of the U.S. State Department claims, would lead to...the more extensive proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. America's allies, you see, may fear that without tests the U.S. nuclear arsenals would lose their effectiveness and, frightened to death by the "Soviet military threat," would decide to acquire their own nuclear bomb.

V.I. Lenin rebuked such pathetic imperialist propagandists a long time ago: "There are some stupid people who shout about Red militarism; they are political rogues, who pretend that they actually believe this rubbish and make such accusations in all directions, using their lawyer's skills to produce false arguments and throw sand in the masses' eyes." The Soviet Union is ready for constructive dialogue with all countries, including the United States, of course. It supports the continuation of the process begun by the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva. But by its actions Washington has seriously worsened the possibility of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and, even more, the practical preparation for a new meeting between our two countries' leaders. As M.S. Gorbachev stated on 21 April, that meeting may still take place if the appropriate international atmosphere is created. It will be worthwhile if it leads to real improvements in the cause of disarmament. The USSR is ready for this. Unfortunately such readiness has not yet been seen from Washington, which has been acting in completely the opposite direction.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1369

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF WRITES ON WARSAW PACT JUBILEE

PM151116 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel General V. Verevkin-Rakhalskiy, first deputy chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact states Joint Armed Forces, under the rubric "On the 31st Anniversary of the Warsaw Pact": "Instrument of Collective Security"]

[Text] The Warsaw Pact was signed on 14 May, 31 years ago. It brought into being an organization whose chief aim was and still is the defense of revolutionary gains and the struggle to preserve and strengthen peace, ease tension, achieve disarmament, and create conditions for very broad cooperation among states regardless of their social system.

The Warsaw Pact is an instrument of collective security. It was created as a countermeasure to the combined efforts of international imperialism, which seeks to destroy the world socialist system and reverse the course of history. As a mighty bastion, the Warsaw Pact Organization has been standing guard over socialism's borders for more than 30 years. The combat alliance of the fraternal peoples and armies has with honor stood the test of time as a constructive factor in European and world politics.

The Warsaw Pact states consistently and persistently champion their policy of peace and security, which will continue to be the main direction in the fraternal parties' activity. M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986 and the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and of the fraternal parties' congresses set forth before the whole world a collection of principles of new political thinking which makes it possible to draw important conclusions for the destiny of all mankind.

A new approach to international affairs has taken shape at meetings of top party and state leaders within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA. Concern for strengthening the security of the socialist community states and responsibility for the destiny of peace and socialism bring to the fore the need to further strengthen the fraternal countries' unity and cohesion.

The socialist community has the necessary potential for further strengthening socialism's positions in the world arena and reliably defending the peoples' peaceful labor. The establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO was a historic achievement for socialism. It strengthened the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces, and upset the calculations of imperialism's aggressive circles for victory in a nuclear world war. The preservation of this equilibrium is a real factor for ensuring peace and international security.

The more strongly the course of historical development undermines imperialism's positions, the more hostile to the peoples' interests the actions of its most reactionary forces become. Indeed, the policy of the United States and its NATO partners in the first half of the eighties is characterized by an abrupt shift away from deterrence toward confrontation. Continuing to pursue their imperial hegemonist policy in international affairs, the West's most aggressive forces are gambling on upsetting the established equilibrium with the USSR and achieving military superiority over the Warsaw Pact.

NATO is not ceasing to carry out large-scale militarist preparations in many directions. Above all, the number of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe is increasing. Tactical nuclear weapons are being further stockpiled on the European continent, and plans are being hatched to bring binary chemical weapons and other means of mass destruction into Europe. A new generation of conventional arms not inferior to tactical nuclear weapons in terms of destructive capacity is being created [sozdavat] in NATO countries.

The flywheel of the arms race is spinning faster and faster in the United States itself. The creation [sozdaniye] of new MX ICBM's, B-1B strategic bombers, and nuclear-powered missile submarines of the Ohio type (Trident system) is in full swing.

In this complex international situation the Warsaw meeting of the Warsaw Pact states' top party and state figures was held in April 1985. A protocol extending the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance for the next 20 years, with a subsequent prolongation by 10 years, was signed there. In an atmosphere of total unanimity the meeting participants reached the conclusion that the Warsaw Pact Organization must continue, as long as the Western powers' aggressive bloc -- NATO -- exists, to play an important role in defending socialism's positions in Europe and in the world and to serve as a reliable instrument for preventing nuclear war and strengthening international security.

It was emphasized at the 27th CPSU Congress that the treaty has been born again, as it were, and that it is hard to imagine world peace as a whole without it today. Imperialism's aggressive policy has been countered by the forces of the European socialist states' peoples united in a military-political alliance and by their clear and consistent initiatives aimed at strengthening peace and curbing and ending the arms race.

The fraternal countries' views on the present situation, new ideas and approaches to solving complex international problems, and an extensive program of measures to normalize the situation were set forth in the statement adopted at the Sofia conference of the Warsaw Pact states Political Consultative Committee (October 1985). At the Sofia conference full support was expressed for the allied states' determination, acting in concert, to continue taking all necessary measures to achieve a turn for the better in European and world affairs.

The new foreign policy initiatives addressed to the whole world and aimed at totally eliminating nuclear weapons from the planet by the year 2000 are vivid evidence of this progressive course of socialism in the international arena. The comprehensive peace program proposed in the 15 January statement and approved and supported by all the Warsaw Pact states has been continued in Berlin. One more constructive and far-reaching initiative resounded from the platform of the 11th SED Congress. It is a question of significantly reducing all components of European states' ground troops and tactical aircraft, as well as the corresponding forces of the United States and Canada stationed in Europe. Here the geographic zone of reduction must extend to the continent's entire territory -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

We have the people and the wherewithal to protect and defend the creative labor and the freedom of our countries' peoples. Our position in the military sphere was defined clearly and precisely at the 27th CPSU Congress: "We intend to continue to act in such a way that no one has grounds for fears, even imagined fears, for his security. But both we and our allies equally want to be rid of the sensation of a threat hanging over us." The peoples of Europe's socialist countries, united in a defensive military-political alliance, remember the lessons of history. Our love of peace must not be seen as a weakness. We have no illusions about the war preparations of the United States and its NATO partners.

In the matter of curbing imperialist aggressors and thwarting their schemes that are ruinous for mankind, our policy will continue to be underpinned by the might of the Warsaw Pact states Joint Armed Forces. It represents a mighty fusion of devotion to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, international fraternity, a high level of technical equipment, and military skill. The combat unity, cohesion, and close cooperation of the fraternal armies are one of the most important factors for ensuring the security of all the world's peoples.

The further strengthening of the Warsaw Pact states' defense might is being ensured by the ever increasing economic potential of the allied countries. In recent years the level of provision of the armed forces with military hardware has increased, their organizational structure is being improved continuously, and the firepower and mobility of formations and units are being enhanced. Having all they need to reliably defend the socialist gains and peaceful labor of their peoples, they are being trained and educated so as to be constantly ready to repulse aggression against any of the Warsaw Pact countries. The invincibility of their might lies in the leadership of defense matters by our countries' Marxist-Leninist communist and workers parties, which regard the defense of socialism's gains as one of their paramount tasks.

The socialist countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact are linked by the single desire for peace and by the firm determination to ensure their peoples' security and to do everything possible to divert from mankind the threat of a new world war. In the present complex international situation we have no other path than to strengthen cooperation in the military sphere and implement measures which will guarantee the inviolability of our borders and ensure that the peoples are able to live and work in a calm atmosphere.

78309

CSO: 5200/1369

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET WEEKLY ON U.S. REFUSAL TO JOIN TEST MORATORIUM

Comparative Statistics

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 5, 28 Jan - 3 Feb 86 p 8

[Item under rubric "Question and Answer"]

[Text] Why is the Pentagon against the United States' joining in the moratorium on nuclear explosions that has been announced by the Soviet Union? -- Ye. Zalov, Arkhangelsk.

The Pentagon and its ilk have made statements in the spirit that the appeal to follow the Soviet example and to cease nuclear explosions is the latest in a series of "propaganda offensives" by the USSR. The attacks made against this new initiative, as in the past, proceed along two directions. One is the far-fetched question of supervision. The second -- and this "argument" has currently become the basic one -- is the assertion that the United States is lagging considerably behind the USSR in the number of test explosions. This is especially so, they state, because the USSR, before announcing the moratorium, carried out a whole "fireworks" of such explosions... Therefore, they say, in order for the United States to guarantee its "national security," it has to make up for what has been lost.

Speculations concerning various kinds of "lags" have already become a customary trick of the Pentagon's. And every time it has turned out that the lag was the result of the "incorrect interpretation of intelligence information" or some such. Let us see what the reason was for the present "lag." For this purpose let us refer to the facts that are cited in the October 1985 issue of the American BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS.

First of all, it is noted here that the United States has been substantially outstripping the USSR with regard to the number of nuclear explosions -- if one counts from the very beginning of nuclear tests. (The Stockholm International Institute for the Study of the Problems of Peace cites the following data: 772 for the United States and 556 for the USSR by the beginning of 1985.)

However, the American side has been complaining about the lag in recent years. Well, then, let us see what the situation has been for the past three years. According to the data in the journal, during the first seven months of 1985, that is, until the announcement of the moratorium, the USSR carried out seven explosions, some of which were for peaceful purposes, but during the same period the United States had carried out nine, plus a tenth one in mid-August. Quoting data provided by the U. S. Department of Energy and the Swedish National Institute of Defense Research, the journal notes that the USSR, with every passing year, has been consistently reducing the number of underground nuclear explosions. Thus, if one takes a seven-month period -- from January through July 1983 -- the USSR carried out 13 explosions, but during the same period in 1984, it carried out 11. Moreover, each time the United States outstripped the USSR in the number of explosions.

In this regard the BULLETIN writes indignantly, "The mythical 'fireworks' of tests that people in the White House speak of, represents the same kind of disrespect for the fact that characterizes the reaction of the Reagan administration to proposals to supervise the armaments. Being incapable of justifying its opposition to the cessation of the nuclear weapons tests and not wanting to renew the negotiations concerning the conclusion of an all-encompassing treaty in this regard, the administration once again is resorting to tactics of intimidation and misinformation."

In the Pentagon it is no secret that the present series of American test explosions is needed both for the purpose of modernizing the existing arsenals, and also to develop Star Wars weapons. If the United States were to join in the Soviet moratorium, that would mean the elimination of a number of programs for rearmament and the creation of new types of weapons for space. Therein lies the reason for the appearance of the myth that the United States is "lagging behind" in the number of nuclear explosions.

As is noted in the Statement by M. S. Gorbachev, we cannot miss the opportunity that still exists to stop the process of improvement of nuclear arms. This, in its turn, will create a barrier to putting offensive arms in space.

U.S. Claims Refuted

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 13, 25 Mar 86 p 2

[Item under rubric "The Reader Asks": "False Arguments"]

[Text] What is Washington's motivation in refusing to join in the moratorium on nuclear explosions that has been announced by the USSR? -- N. Moshkin, Vasilkov, Kiev Oblast]

The United States, in refusing to join in the Soviet moratorium, uses a whole set of "arguments." Let us examine what stands behind them.

"Argument" 1: "The decision of the USSR to introduce the moratorium is propaganda."

But the Soviet Union immediately proposed to the United States that it respond with the same kind of "propaganda step" -- the cessation of nuclear tests by the American side. The United States responded by carrying out a series of underground explosions.

"Argument" 2: "You can't trust the Russians -- they have already broken the moratorium once."

We remind the authors of this "argument" that on 31 March 1958 the USSR made the decision concerning the unilateral cessation of tests and called upon the other nuclear countries to follow that example. On 30 August 1958 it deemed itself to be free of that pledge. But that occurred only after Washington and London had ignored the Soviet initiative and had carried out an intensive program of nuclear tests.

"Argument" 3: "There are difficulties with verification."

In response to this, the USSR has announced very definitely: verification can be completely guaranteed both by the national technical means, and with the aid of international procedures -- in necessary instances, with inspection on the spot.

"Argument" 4: "The Soviet Union has the advantage -- it has conducted many more tests than the United States has."

But this also does not correspond to the truth: according to data provided by the Swedish Institute of Defense, the USSR and the United States, from 1 January through 6 August 1985, carried out nine explosions each. (Last year the United States carried out a total of 18 explosions.) But if one takes the entire postwar period, it turns out that the United States carried out approximately 40 percent more nuclear tests than the USSR, and together with the other Western countries, 70 percent more.

Another "argument" also used to be given: "The Russians are ready to renew the tests on the very next day after the expiration of the 31 December 1985 moratorium."

The Soviet Union extended the unilateral moratorium by three months, declaring that that moratorium would continue to be in effect if the United States followed our example. Subsequently, as everyone knows, in M. S. Gorbachev's reply to the leaders of six countries, it was stated, "The Soviet Union will also not conduct nuclear explosions after 31 March -- until the first nuclear explosion in the United States."

Washington's "argumentation" convinces us of one thing: for the White House, refusal to conduct nuclear tests is undesirable, inasmuch as that contradicts the long-term goals of the United States -- the attainment of military superiority. This policy is inseparably linked also with the beloved offspring of the Pentagon -- the Star Wars program. If the United States were to refuse to conduct nuclear tests, it would also be deprived of the opportunity to develop, test, and deploy offensive space weapons that are

based on the principle of nuclear explosive "pumped" laser systems, and the opportunity to improve the existing nuclear potential.

"The Reagan administration will not change its position," THE WASHINGTON POST reports, quoting governmental sources. Apparently, Washington will continue to feel that it is unnecessary to reject a policy that is fraught with the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe.

(For more details concerning this subject, see IZVESTIYA, 22 February 1986. Also see ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 5, 1986.)

5075

CSO: 5200/1352

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: COMMENTS ON MORATORIUM EXTENSION, U.S. RESPONSE

Reagan 'Propaganda Trick'

LD160441 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1950 GMT 15 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Ignor Kudrin]

[Text] The other day President Reagan met with a group of students and told them that the United States has a consistent and logical foreign policy. He spoke eloquently about peace and prosperity and at the same time said the following: Surely it is much more sensible to get rid of weapons than to live under the threat that some madman might press the nuclear button. Yet the Soviet Union's proposals are aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons and at ending nuclear tests. This was reasserted on Soviet television yesterday by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. However, it seems that once again official America is deaf to Moscow's peace appeals. In any event, White House spokesman Larry Speakes, in hastily commenting on the Soviet leader's speech, virtually rejected our new proposal on an immediate meeting by the leaders of the two countries specifically to discuss the problems of banning nuclear tests. At the same time, Speakes was rather suspiciously silent about the extension of our moratorium. Thus, the words addressed to the young Americans by the U.S. President concerning the sensible elimination of nuclear weapons have turned out to be just a propaganda trick.

TV Correspondents Discussion

LD152104 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 May 86

["Telebridge" program conducted by Boris Kalyagin in Moscow, with the participation of correspondent Vladimir Dunayev in Washington, Igor Vykhukholev in Tokyo, and Eduard Sorokin in London, video shows Kalyagin in studio, with Dunayev, Vykhukholev and Sorokin shown on screens in the studio; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Kalyagin] Hello, comrades. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech on Soviet television was a major international event. It has given rise to great interest in virtually all countries of the world. We have linked up from studio 20 with capitals situated on three of the earth's continents. On the line are our correspondents: in Washington, Vladimir Dunayev; in Tokyo, Igor Vykhukholev; and in London, Eduard Sorokin.

Comrade Gorbachev's speech was addressed to the Soviet people and to the whole world, but there were words in it addressed directly to the President of the United States. This was the proposal to meet immediately and reach agreement on the banning of nuclear testing. What was Washington's reaction to this initiative?

[Dunayev] I would say that Larry Speakes, the White House press spokesman, reacted fairly quickly to Comrade Gorbachev's speech. But this was a negative reaction, something people here in Washington are already used to. He said that the White House finds nothing new in the proposal for a meeting. When correspondents asked him: What do you mean, nothing new has happened?--there has been the accident in Chernobyl, the whole world is worried, an event has happened that has highlighted the nuclear threat. He did not react at all. That is, the White House position is, as before, a negative one, an obstructionist one.

[Kalyagin] Finally, on our moratorium. Formerly the United States responded negatively to our proposal to stop nuclear testing, referring to difficulties with verification and to the fact that it lags behind the Soviet Union. For more than 7 months we have not held nuclear tests and have agreed to wait even until 6 August. It would seem that all, even the most far-fetched arguments, have been canceled out. For all that, is the United States ready to follow our example?

[Dunayev] You know, this has become clear to the present administration. It does not want to have limitation of the arms race. And it could only come to this under pressure, under the strong pressure of circumstances from its allies in Western Europe and, first and foremost, from Americans themselves. Here, so to speak, lies the key. It will not come voluntarily to this. The Soviet initiatives have already brought tangible results: as yet not a positive response from the administration, but a different one--the desire of congress and congressmen. This has now manifested itself: They have put forward a resolution that the administration should be refused appropriations of funds for holding nuclear tests. This is now being discussed in Congress, following precisely from recent events, from the recent calamity. This has served to somehow highlight this danger for U.S. Congressmen.

And there is one more think I would like to say: 100 municipalities and towns in the United States--100--have this year alone adopted a decision calling on the Reagan administration to stop nuclear testing fully, that is, to meet and follow the example of the Soviet Union. One hundred municipalities, including the biggest American cities, means that the movement is on its way, that Americans are beginning to understand where truth and falsehood lie and pressure is being put on the administration.

[Kalyagin] London could do quite a lot to stop the nuclear arms race. I recall simply that it was precisely between the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain that the agreement on the cessation of three types of nuclear testing was signed. And now Britain, given the political will, could help to stop nuclear explosions on earth forever. What has been the reaction in Great Britain to Comrade Gorbachev's speech?

[Sorokin] First of all, the reaction. All yesterday evening, the main topic of the news broadcasts on television and radio in Great Britain was Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech. Today, all the front pages in virtually all the British central papers were devoted to it.

First impression. They are giving a pretty detailed summary of what Mikhail Sergeyevich said about the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the consequences associated with it. And the second part, concerning the approach of the Soviet Union to the most important contemporary problem, to stopping the arms race, to the elimination of nuclear weapons, it seems to me, has still not been properly reflected. No, they are talking about the extension by the Soviet Union of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, and about the renewal of the proposals to President Reagan to meet immediately in European capital or Hiroshima. But this is just establishing the fact. As yet there have been no serious comments.

[Kalyagin] It would seem that London is waiting for a signal from Washington before expressing its attitude toward our proposals.

[Sorokin] Yes, so it would seem. But I must say that the interest of the British public just like our journalistic colleagues, is extraordinarily great. I am judging this, specifically, by a press conference which was held today at the Soviet Embassy in connection with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech.

[Kalyagin] Japan is the only country in the world that has experienced a nuclear attack--carried out by the United States. Mankind has not forgotten that. In memorial to that tragedy we set our moratorium on nuclear testing from 6 August last year, that is, the anniversary of the atomic attack on Hiroshima. And now we have extended the moratorium to 6 August of this year. How have they reacted to our initiative in Japan?

[Vykhukholev] The content of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech on Soviet television is today at the center of attention of the whole country. True, reaction to it is not at all unanimous. The government has done all it can to avoid any comment or assessment. Moreover, the tone here has been set by Prime Minister Nakasone himself. Answering journalists' questions this morning, he said that it is more important to achieve progress at the Geneva disarmament talks. Comrade Gorbachev's speech was received quite differently by the opposition parties and the public. Today I was talking with (Manaya Kubota), Socialist Party deputy to the Upper House of the Diet. First, she stressed the immense importance of the fact that the Soviet Union had extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 6 August.

[Kalyagin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev suggested Hiroshima as a possible place for holding a meeting with President Reagan. This has also paid tribute to the martyr city that underwent the atomic attack. And what are they saying about this in Hiroshima? Is the city prepared to facilitate the holding of the Soviet-American summit meeting?

[Vykhukholev] Today, the mayor of Hiroshima, Takeshi Araki, issued a special statement. It says that the people of Hiroshima have waited for many years to have a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in their city. This proposal, Takeshi Araki stressed, meets Hiroshima's aspirations.

An eyewitness to the atomic bombing, honorary professor of Hiroshima University Ichiro Muritaki said that the Soviet initiatives are evidence of the serious intentions of the USSR regarding the controlling of and education about nuclear weapons. Professor Muritaki is planning to start off a mass campaign calling on the United States to respond positively to the Soviet Union's proposal.

[Kalyagin] So the first world reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech shows that the new Soviet peace initiative has been received with approval and hope. The hope is that thanks to this step, some progress will be made toward reducing the nuclear threat to our planet.

As for the leaders of the United States, they have the opportunity of demonstrating in deeds their concern for the health and lives of people. We will consider the hasty, negative response of the White House--to which we have become accustomed--not to be the last word of the U.S. administration.

Washington, Tokyo, London. Thank you for taking part. Good-bye.

Broadcast to North America

LD161419 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 May 86

[Excerpts] We begin with our observer's comment on the Soviet Union's latest decision to extend its moratorium on nuclear testing until 6 August. Vladislav Kozyakov will now answer several question on that score.

[Question] First, what is the major purpose of the decision?

[Kozyakov] It is a new effort to promote a complete and universal test ban and thus to contribute to curbing the nuclear arms race and preventing a catastrophe. It's truly symbolic, in my view, that the Soviet unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions went into effect last 6 August when the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima was observed throughout the world. It is another indication that the Soviet side is prepared to make a practical step toward nuclear disarmament without a delay.

[Question] How could you explain Washington's negative reaction to the latest Soviet proposal?

[Kozyakov] It reflects both the philosophy and the policy of the present American administration. It relies on nuclear arms in conducting its foreign policy and is building up a superior military force. Such an approach is profitable for military-industrial corporations, but it leads to extremely dangerous consequences for international security. Actually, Washington pushes the world to ever new rounds of the arms race, which is equally dangerous for the United States and other nations.

[Question] Is there any connection between the Chernobyl accident and the Soviet decision to extend its moratorium?

[Kozyakov] Most certainly. Moscow calls on Washington to look at the nuclear test ban more seriously now that the Chernobyl accident has once again shown what would happen to humanity in case of a nuclear war.

Senator Byrd's Comments Hit

LD161855 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 16, TASS--The latest important peace initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his address on Soviet television have drawn enthusiastic responses from the broad international public.

The Soviet leader's offer to meet President Ronald Reagan without delay in the capital of any European state or in Hiroshima to reach agreement on a nuclear test ban is viewed by sensible people as an excellent chance for progress towards the solution of the most important and urgent question of our time, nuclear arms control and the exclusion of nuclear war from the life of humanity.

But it is not everyone that has welcomed the Soviet peace initiatives. They clearly irritated the leadership of the United States. Some, among them the White House, have rejected the proposed meeting out of hand, without going into explanations. Others, camouflaging the unwillingness of the USA to start a serious dialogue on the problem of vital importance to the whole of mankind, are resorting to below-the-belt tactics in a bid to misrepresent the Soviet position and to call in question the Soviet Union's goodwill. Such a method was used, among others, by Robert Byrd, the Senate Democratic minority leader. Addressing the Senate, he said that the Soviet proposal was downright insulting to the United States.

The displeasure of that politician was caused by two circumstances: The Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests to August 6, that is, to the date when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima in Japan more than 40 years ago, and also the fact that it was that city, in which thousands of civilians became the first victims of U.S.-made atomic weapons in human history, that was named by the Soviet side as a possible venue for the summit. Feigning "outrage," the senator argued that the use of weapons of mass destruction against the defenceless civilians had been all but a "benevolent action" which had allegedly made it possible to expedite the end of the Second World War and to save hundreds of thousands of lives.

Anyone having an idea of history will be amazed by such a gross distortion of commonly known historical facts. Richard Byrd, a leading U.S. politician who has access to classified information, should well know that the atomic bombing of the Japanese cities was militarily unwarranted because Japan was on the brink of capitulation as it was. A recent study by American experts on the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki directly points out that this decision was prompted exclusively by political motives, namely, by the desire to show to the world the U.S. military might.

So Mr Byrd should not strike the posture of an insulted. [sentence as received] The atomic bombing of Hiroshima was not prompted by the military necessity but was an action taken by the promoters of "Pax America." Unlike Byrd, honest Americans understand this and make efforts to prevent a repetition of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and fully and completely to remove the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. Hundreds of thousands of ordinary Americans all over the United States mark this anniversary every year with mass anti-war demonstrations, a manifestation of their bitterness over what was done by America.

Last August, as the anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was marked, American peace campaigners from all over the country came to Washington, took each other by the hands and encircled the Congress, the White House and the Pentagon in a huge human "chain of peace." They demanded that the administration not allow the recurrence of new Hiroshimas.

According to the AP, that demonstration, in which more than 50,000 took part, was the most memorable anti-war protest in the U.S. capital in the post-war period.

Senator Byrd, like other American law-makers, is fond of posturing as a "public servant." However, his words and deeds serve not the majority of the U.S. population, who demand an end to the arms race and the removal of the threat of nuclear war.

If Senator Byrd gives advice as to what lessons others should learn from the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station, he himself should remember the view of Dr Robert Gale, who warned against the awesome consequences of nuclear catastrophe, into which the military-industrial complex of the USA is pushing the world. "If we are very hard pressed to deal with the 300 victims of a nuclear reactor accident, I think it should be very evident how inadequate would be any response to a nuclear attack," he said.

Soviet CSCE Official Cited

LD162154 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 16, TASS--The decision of the Soviet Government to extend the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests to August 6 has evoked enthusiastic responses from the world public. This responsible action became the Soviet Union's contribution to international week of action against war and for peace and cooperation in Europe, TASS has been told by Yevgeniy Silin, a deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation [CSCE].

He noted that thousands of the committee's activists, among them parliamentarians, public figures, scientists and workers, had taken part in the rallies, demonstrations and other activities of the recent week. They have called upon allied organisations in other countries to support the Soviet initiatives for stronger peace, for detente, for ending the arms race and for preventing an arms race in outer space.

The peace-loving public has every right to demand from the countries participating in the Helsinki process resolute implementation at their new meeting in Vienna in November of the stipulations of the Final Act, the most important of them being the complete renunciation of the use of force in international relations, Silin stressed.

Warnke 'Welcomes' Decision

LD170545 Moscow TASS in English 0532 GMT 17 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 17, TASS--Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has welcomed the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on tests of nuclear weapons until August 6. In an interview with a TASS correspondent Mr Warnke pointed out that the decision was an exceptionally positive step. He said he also regarded as very useful the proposals advanced by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on strengthening cooperation within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Paul Warnke said such measures became ripe long ago. As far as the Chernobyl accident is concerned, the U.S. expert stated that it should serve as a reminder to the world that a threat to mankind from the use of nuclear weapons is unimaginably more serious than that from a breakdown in the operation of a nuclear power station.

'U.S. Seeks Military Superiority'

LD201743 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 20 May 86

["USSR's Moratorium Means Serious Attitude to Disarmament"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, May 20, TASS--TASS News Analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, in an interview with a TASS correspondent, has said that India welcomes the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until August 6 of this year. This step shows, the head of the Indian Government pointed out, that the USSR maintains a very serious attitude to nuclear disarmament.

Such an evaluation quite accurately describes the Soviet Union's stand on such matter which is so important to the whole of mankind as the removal of the nuclear danger. As of today, to end nuclear tests is the most urgent and paramount task.

It is essential to stop all nuclear explosions before concrete measures for limiting and reducing nuclear arms are elaborated, first of all between the USSR and the USA, and before machinery for comprehensive control over disarmament is worked out. To do that means to stop the upgrading of ever new specimens of nuclear weapons through nuclear tests. Of course, this does not mean that all nuclear-disarmament matters can be put aside and that the green light should be given only to the termination of nuclear explosions.

All matters connected with the removal of the nuclear danger should be the subject of urgent agreements. But an end to nuclear tests is a matter of particular urgency. This is why the Soviet Union will voluntarily, unilaterally continue to abide by the moratorium for a whole year--since August 6, 1985, when it first took this obligation upon itself, until August 6 of this year. On May 14, while extending the moratorium once again, the USSR again urged the United States to weigh in all seriousness the extent of danger which hangs over mankind and to listen to the international community's opinion demanding an end to nuclear explosions. They in Washington stubbornly refuse to follow the Soviet Union's example. Moreover, in so doing, they try not only to justify their policy of continuation of nuclear weapon testing but also to present the Soviet moratorium as a "propaganda move" and as "some trick which is aimed at distracting attention."

Upon sound consideration, it is rather difficult to imagine how the Soviet Union's real, concrete measures aimed at ending nuclear explosions and consequently at suspending the sophistication of weapons can be propaganda moves (!)! Explosions have not been conducted for the tenth month already!

For their part, Washington spokesmen state that it is necessary to conduct nuclear tests "to maintain the reliability and credibility" of U.S. deterrent systems. In so doing, they even theorize: If the concept of deterrent is recognized, it means that the need for nuclear tests should be inevitably recognized as well (!)! This is only a clumsy manoeuvre, since an end to nuclear explosions is no hindrance to deterrence and even gives an opportunity for the sides to move on to lower equal levels of armaments within the framework of the selfsame concept of deterrence until complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The matter is, however, that Washington seeks military superiority over the USSR, and not lower levels of nuclear potentials. And that means a still more dangerous spiral of the race of arms, of nuclear ones, in the first place.

U.S. 'Panamint' Test 21 May

LD211537 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 21, TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports: A new nuclear explosion code-named "Panamint" has been conducted in a Nevada test site today contrary to the demands of world public that an end be put to the nuclear weapons race, which is a source of lethal danger to mankind.

It was already the fourth nuclear test to have been conducted by the United States this year and 11th since the Soviet Union introduced on August 6, 1985 a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts. The Washington sponsors of a further build-up of the arms race and of its spreading into outer space hypocritically declare that the USA is ready to work jointly with the Soviet Union for a cut and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

The new test in Nevada has again demonstrated that such statements are worthless, the more so that the "Panamint" test was conducted soon after the Soviet

Union announced the extension of the unilateral moratorium till August 6, this year, which was evaluated everywhere, including in the USA as a new important step on the way towards curbing the nuclear weapons race.

Test Replies to Ban Appeal

LD211858 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 21 May 86

["Test of Political Morality"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, May 21, TASS--TASS Political News Analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

The USA today carried out another nuclear explosion, the fourth of those officially announced this year, at its Nevada testing site. Washington in this way replied to the Soviet Union's appeal to it a week ago to weigh up with utmost responsibility the measure of danger looming over mankind, to listen to the opinion of the world community and, in light of the lessons of the Chernobyl accident, to demonstrate in practice its care for human life and health: immediately to meet at the top level and reach accord on a nuclear test ban. This appeal was not mere propaganda: The USSR decided to extend to August 6, the 41st anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy, its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing.

So it was not the desire to score propaganda points that guided Moscow as it appealed anew to the U.S. leadership to wake up to the fact that the nuclear age imperatively demands a new approach to international relations, new political thinking and a new policy. The world community welcomed the Soviet position as an act of state wisdom, and expected Washington to listen at long last to the voice of reason. The latest test of a nuclear device in Nevada dashed these hopes.

The U.S. administration showed it was not going to reckon with the will of the peoples of the world and the overwhelming majority of Americans. The Nevada explosion was conducted on the day when the Washington city hall passed a resolution in support of a mutual U.S.-Soviet ban on nuclear testing. This ban, the resolution says, could be a concrete and easily attainable first step towards the complete termination of the nuclear arms buildup.

Washington heaped up shameless lies and slander over the tragedy at the Chernobyl atomic power station and broke its own records of hypocrisy. But the nuclear arsenals, which the United States is stockpiling and improving so strenuously, harbour thousands upon thousands of catastrophes which are far more fearsome than the Chernobyl accident. That is why the latest blast in Nevada actually became a test of the political morality of the U.S. administration, the umpteenth test it failed.

U.S. 'Service Record' Noted

LD211811 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 21, TASS--Correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports: A new nuclear blast code-named "Panamint" was conducted today at the range in Nevada. A spokesman of the Nevada range said the test had to do with armaments.

This is already the fourth officially announced nuclear test by the United States this year and the 11th since the Soviet Union imposed a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions starting with August 6, 1985.

The "Panamint" test is also a sort of anniversary in the "service record" of Washington officials who insist on a further spiraling of the arms race and spreading it to outer space. According to the United States Department of Energy, this was the 650th officially announced nuclear test by the United States since 1951.

The United States administration rejects the Soviet Union's call to join its moratorium on all nuclear tests and again and again declares its resolve to continue expanding this shameful "service record" further. Such resolve was stated once again by the State Department just one day before "Panamint."

It is directly said in a collection of documents concerning the development of the U.S. Armed Forces and the impact that this has on Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, that was submitted to Congress, that the United States needs nuclear tests to perfect and modernise nuclear arms.

In words Washington hypocritically declares the readiness of the United States to work together with the Soviet Union to reduce and even totally eliminate nuclear arms. The latest test in Nevada demonstrated again that such statements are worth nothing, the more so that the "Panamint" test was conducted shortly after the Soviet Union had announced the extension of its unilateral moratorium till August 6 of this year. Throughout the world, including in the United States, this Soviet action was qualified as a new important step along the road to curbing the nuclear arms race.

The spokesman of the Nevada range said that the latest test in Nevada was "purely accidentally" named after Panamint, a ghost town in California. Decaying houses still stand in that town but without any trace of life. It appears that those who named the latest nuclear test in Nevada after a ghost town consciously or unconsciously experience an irresistible desire to see our entire planet deprived of life.

It is time for those in Washington who are spiraling the nuclear arms race to understand that by creating conditions for this race to escape control they are increasing the danger of nuclear war which would turn not only other countries but also the United States into a "ghost country."

Antinuclear Protestors 'Repressed'

LD211618 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 21, TASS--TASS News Analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The American authorities have arrested five anti-war protestors at the nuclear test site in Nevada, where another nuclear explosion was carried out today. This has been said to a TASS correspondent in New York by a spokesman for the American Peace Test, an organization of peace campaigners. In spite of public demands in the USA and all over the world, the Washington administration would not stop nuclear explosions, as the Soviet Union did unilaterally way back last August. The American campaigners for a world without nuclear weapons well understand how dangerous nuclear tests are and for what purpose ever new types of weaponry are being tested at the Nevada site and that is why they courageously risk being imprisoned or heavily fined. The U.S. administration represses them especially ruthlessly. The U.S. leaders, on one hand, are trying to assure the world that they are seeking the total elimination of nuclear weapons--without specifying the schedule--while, on the other, are severely persecuting in their own country all those who are honestly wishing to rid mankind of the nuclear threat today, before the end of this century, as the Soviet Union proposes, rather than in some indefinite future.

The world has reached a very dangerous point. So many nuclear munitions have now been accumulated that the further buildup of the stocks of such weapons is merely senseless. In this situation the age-old mentality of politicians and their inclination to try to settle contentious problems and problems of security by force today can lead to the suicide of mankind as a whole. That is why a new mentality, a new approach and a drastic revision of the fundamental principles of coexistence in the world are needed today.

However, the Washington administration responds with new nuclear explosions to every appeal of the Soviet Union for an end to nuclear explosions as the simplest and most obvious means of demonstrating goodwill for talks on nuclear disarmament. However, it grossly disregards world public opinion and toughens the repression of campaigners for a nuclear test ban at home.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1375

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROHIBITION

IZVESTIYA: U.S. TESTS MORE SERIOUS THAN THE FIRST

PM051619 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian # May 16 1986, p. 1 (1 page)

[Political Observer V. Matveyev article under the "Soviet Opinion" rubric:
"Decency Is Not Their Rule"]

[Text] Official circles in Washington and London, which are to blame for the fact that the question of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests is not being resolved, are these days active in the conscious role of instigators of an anti-Soviet ballyhoo in connection with the accident at the Chernobyl AES [Atomic Power Station]. This is no mere coincidence. At the very time when, to a propaganda fanfare, Washington was announcing the President's decision to set up a special group to "study the impact of the Soviet AES," it became known that a device had malfunctioned during the underground detonation of a U.S. nuclear weapon in Nevada on 10 April. The radiation had gotten out of control. British nuclear weapons are also manufactured there.

Our country has confirmed its readiness to enter at any moment to a joint moratorium with the United States with the provision that the latter does not conduct nuclear tests. Even now, after it resumed work on nuclear tests in our country, the Soviet Government is in no hurry to resume tests, despite what is happening in Nevada.

Technical progress in the peaceful use of atomic energy should not even. All incidents along that path require us to be especially careful not to be avoided in the future. Mankind has mastered the most complex processes on this path and is undoubtedly capable of also ensuring the safe development of peaceful atomic energy for people's good.

This is what has to be worked at, and not only on the national scale but also on the broad international plane by the constructive efforts of states and governments.

But is that also the aim guiding the agreement-making policy in the west?

"We are stepping up the pressure"... That, as it turns out, WASHINGTON POST report on 3 May, is how a White House official (Robert F. Kennedy, official circles' approach to what happened at the Chernobyl AES.

Pressure, coercion, and strong-arm methods.... People remain true to form in the centers of power across the ocean. What kind of decency or norms of morality can there be with people who have on their conscience the course of "improving" an already monstrous weapon, which they continue to test contrary to the world community's demands! The "pressure" which the aforementioned White House staffer spoke of is yet another fact demonstrating the ease and cynicism with which official Washington resorts to the methods of "psychological warfare." They claim that they lack "information" even though they must be aware that it takes a certain amount of time [neobkhodimo khotya by minimalnoye vremya] to clarify the facts of what happened. They claim that they are trying to "give assistance" but in fact they are whipping up sentiments hostile to the USSR.

Nor does the conduct of the British Government, which ostentatiously recalled a group of tourists and students from the Soviet Union, look any better. If official London is really so concerned it should turn its gaze toward Nevada and to Las Vegas, which is just a few dozen kilometers from the site of the U.S. nuclear explosions! There can be no doubt that the world public will draw the appropriate conclusions from this unseemly campaign launched by those who would like to make political gain of the most disgraceful kind, since it is a question here of aims and schemes that have nothing to do with concern for the fate of our planet. Such actions, such tactics deserve nothing more than the most resolute castigation.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1375

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET EMBASSY IN U.S. MEETS WITH PUBLIC GROUPS ON TEST BAN

LD081037 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 8, TASS--A meeting with the leaders of the public organizations "Physicians for Social Responsibility," "Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" and "Greenpeace" was held at the embassy of the USSR in Washington in conjunction with their appeal to the Soviet Union on the question of a moratorium on nuclear testing.

Charge d'Affaires of the USSR in the United States Oleg Sokolov emphasized that the Soviet Union highly appreciated the profound concern expressed by the organizations in their message for resolving the question of a nuclear test ban.

The USSR, he went on to say, is opposed in principle to the continued nuclear explosions and it believes that a Soviet-American moratorium on such tests could become, given a strict and reliable verification of the compliance with it, an important practical step toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

The Soviet Government expressed its readiness to return to the question of a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions any moment if the United States refrained from conducting them.

Even following an 8-month-long moratorium on nuclear blasts, as Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said in his report in Moscow on April 22, the Soviet Union is in no hurry now to resume them. This is another graphic demonstration that the USSR is doing everything within its capabilities to make moratorium on nuclear explosions a reality.

The representatives of the American public organizations expressed their appreciation in connection with the fact that their message was carefully examined in Moscow. They spoke highly of the USSR's stand on the issue of a nuclear test moratorium.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1375

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW CITES BILD: KOHL URGES U.S.-SOVIET TALKS ON TEST BAN

LD161812 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 16 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Reports of a second secret letter from FRG Chancellor Kohl to President Reagan have appeared in Bonn. Excerpts from this secret letter somehow ended up on the pages of BILD. It is worth familiarizing you with these excerpts. It is reported that in his letter, Helmut Kohl calls on Reagan to begin talks with the Soviet Union on limiting and halting future nuclear tests.

BILD writes that in his first secret letter, the West German chancellor insisted that the West, as they say, once more take into its hands the initiative in the field of ending nuclear tests. But such a call, it seems to me, comrades, sounds more like a challenge to commonsense and logic. When may I ask, was the West so active in the field of ending nuclear tests that it can now once again take the initiative into its hands? Is it not a case of being completely the other way round? Has the United States or, say, even France ever halted nuclear tests and followed the example of the Soviet Union which unilaterally halted these tests and which has again extended the moratorium?

Well, let us go on. According to BILD, Kohl wrote this letter because there is a danger that Reagan could begin a new stage of the arms race. But why, may I ask, is there talk here of a new stage? Has Reagan ever halted the arms race? In his letter, Kohl proposes that measures be taken to counteract the efforts directed at the public by which the Soviet Union allegedly puts pressure on the West in matters of nuclear weapons tests. This is obviously the root of the problem. The whole thing obviously comes down to attempts of certain Western powers to somehow counteract the decisive efforts of our country directed at ending the arms race and neutralizing the effect of these efforts on world public opinion. It is precisely this, most likely, that gave rise to the so-called second secret letter from Kohl.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1375

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA ON IMPORTANCE OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT FOR ASIA

PM130930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 86 First Edition p 6

[Political Observer Vsevolod Ochinnikov article: "Nuclear Disarmament and Security in Asia"]

[Text] The Soviet Union, having formulated the fundamental principles of an all-embracing system of international security at the 27th CPSU Congress and having put forward a program for the stage-by-stage liquidation of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, fully takes into account the interests of Asian and Pacific countries in these matters. Being a state whose longest border lies in Asia, the USSR strives to ensure that Asia and the Pacific are neither a source of tension nor an arena of military confrontation. The recently published statement by the Soviet Government proposes that a broad exchange of opinions begins between all interested countries in this part of the world on questions of organizing equal, mutually advantageous, and stable trade, economic, technological, scientific, and cultural cooperation, and also identifies possible spheres for such cooperation.

The Soviet Government believes that, despite differences in political systems, ideologies, and world philosophies, the people in Asia and the Pacific are linked by common vital interests, and are thus interested in the elaboration of a joint comprehensive approach toward regional problems. The Soviet Union proposes that bilateral and multilateral consultations be used to achieve settlement of disputed questions, to consolidate mutual confidence, and to gradually create prerequisites for holding an all-Asian forum so as to embark jointly on the quest for constructive solutions. A separate conference of Pacific countries could possibly be held to examine questions of security, including economic security.

The Soviet program for delivering mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe is in profound harmony with the moods of people in Asia, the largest and most populous part of the world. It was, indeed, in Asia that the first American atom bombs exploded, taking many human lives and turning the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to ashes.

It was Asia that was the object of the first plans for the use of American nuclear weapons in "regional conflicts." Documents that have been subsequently declassified testify that the Pentagon was seriously preparing for this in

order to isolate the peoples of Asia and the Pacific from the Soviet colonialist attempts to liberate them. In Asia and the Pacific, the U.S. is exerting pressure on isolated states and the situation in the Taiwan Strait (Taiwan'sky Probo) is becoming ever more tense.

It was in Asia and the Pacific that the most bitter consequences of the nuclear arms race were first felt. Japanese fishermen suffered from the radioactive dust of an American warship which exploded at Bikini Atoll.

It must be added that it is in Asia and the Pacific that states were unwilling to accede to the Moscow Treaty banning tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water and continuing to conduct nuclear explosions.

U.S. imperialist circles have recently stepped up their attempts to transform Asia and the Pacific into yet another arena of military-political confrontation with the USSR, the other socialist states, and national liberation forces.

The objective of American strategists is to turn East Asia and the Pacific and Indian Oceans which wash its coasts into a region for the deployment of forward-based nuclear means, like Western Europe and its contiguous Atlantic Ocean. This goes to explain the feverish buildup of U.S. nuclear weapons and the creation of new bases for the "Rapid Deployment Forces" in a region where the second largest group of U.S. Armed forces abroad is already stationed.

Encouraging military ties is, then, U.S. imperialism is striving to transform this nation into a key link of an anti-Soviet and antisocialist "Eastern front." It is in pursuit of this objective that they want to close the triangle of military ties between Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul, and also to open the way for the creation of a "Pacific Community" in which it is also planned to involve the NATO states in addition to military bloc allies. All this indicates that the Soviet proposals to create an all-embracing system of international security and the idea of a stage-by-stage liquidation of nuclear weapons are particularly topical for Asia. A total ban on nuclear tests, both on the mainland and in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, would primarily correspond with the vital interests of Asian peoples.

The implementation of the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament would fundamentally improve the situation in Asia and the Pacific. Its stage-by-stage implementation could provide the background for ensuring the security interests of states not possessing nuclear weapons. They would officially proclaim their commitment to the three non-nuclear principles: not to possess, produce, or introduce such weapons on their territories. Nuclear powers would pledge under international law not to use nuclear weapons against countries and regions in that part of world maintaining a nuclear-free status.

If agreement were reached on the total liquidation of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, it would be immeasurably easier to reach accord on other measures to consolidate security in this part of the world, which accounts for one-third of the planet's land mass and over two-thirds of its population--for example, to agree on freezing the level of military activeness in Asia and the Pacific. It is well known that the U.S. desires to create a nuclear threat

against the Soviet Union from the south was an important factor in the fact that the United States unilaterally broke off the Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation and termination of naval activity in the Indian Ocean and stepped up its militarization.

If a nuclear-free world were to become a universal lodestar, there would no longer be any need to knock together new military blocs in the region or expand existing ones. Favorable prerequisites would be created for the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of Asian states and in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

In order to ensure that the system of Asian security is truly reliable, its fundamental principles must include the renunciation of foreign backing for antigovernment and terrorist armed groups. This would open the way for political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and Cambodia, thus eliminating two dangerous seats of tension on the continent.

The Soviet Union's call for a joint quest for ways to consolidate security in Asia and the Pacific, utilizing in this process, in particular, the experience of the all-European Conference, does not in any way imply a mechanical transplant of the Helsinki scheme onto Asian ground. Many elements of the European experience in detente, however, can be applied in Asia. They include respect for sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs, nonuse of force, peaceful settlement of disputes, the right of people to determine their own fate, and the development of equal and mutually advantageous cooperation.

In the USSR's opinion, the concept of Asian security could include the 5 principles of peaceful coexistence ("pancha shila") elaborated in the past by the states of the continent, the 10 Bandung Principles, and the several proposals by Asia's nonaligned and socialist countries. Perhaps the most long-standing among them is the initiative of India and other contiguous states to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. If the UN declaration on this question were to be successfully implemented, the cause of consolidating Asian security would be immediately and substantially advanced. The Soviet Union is an active champion of this, aiming at the convening of the appropriate international conference.

The socialist countries have put forward a number of constructive initiatives on various aspects of Asian security in recent times. In addition to the program for nuclear disarmament, the USSR proposed a discussion on the question of confidence-building measures in the Far East (along lines similar to the ones already being implemented in Europe on the basis of the Helsinki accords). The Mongolian People's Republic proposed the conclusion of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force between Asian and Pacific countries. Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia consistently advocate the transformation of Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation, and also the establishment of good-neighborly relations with the ASEAN states. A number of constructive initiatives aimed at speeding up the peaceful and democratic unification of Korea and the easing of military confrontation in the Korean peninsula have been put forward by the DPRK Government.

The achievement of lasting security in Asia and the Pacific is unthinkable without the great Chinese people's participation in the process. It is gratifying that the two nuclear powers situated in Asia--the USSR and the PRC--have pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and also that the PRC is against the militarization of space. It can be said with satisfaction that there has been a certain improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations. Differences in approach still remain, in particular regarding a number of international problems. There is also something else, though--an opportunity in many cases to work together and to develop cooperation on an equal and principled basis, not to the detriment of third countries. The opportunities for cooperation between the USSR and China are enormous. The utilization of these reserves would definitely be to the advantage of Asian security.

There are other favorable factors for the attainment of this goal. They include the burgeoning of antiwar and antinuclear sentiments, evidenced in particular by the decision made by the relevant states to proclaim the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. The international prestige and positive role of the Nonaligned Movement are growing, the struggle to restructure international economic relations on a fair and equal basis is spreading.

The elaboration of the concept of Asian security is a long-term task that has to be solved stage-by-stage, moving on from simple to complex aspects. "The CPSU," the new edition of its program says, "advocates the pooling of efforts by all interested states for the purpose of ensuring security in Asia, for a joint quest by them for a constructive solution to this problem." And Asia's transformation into a continent of good-neighborliness and cooperation would, in its turn, augment the pan-human potential of peace, common sense, and goodwill which was spoken of at the 27th CPSU Congress.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1375

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

ICELAND FOREIGN MINISTER GIVES VIEWS ON NORDIC ZONE ISSUE

Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID in Icelandic 10 Apr 86 p 1

[Article: "'No Support for Proposal of Danish Parliament,' says Icelandic Foreign Minister Matthias A. Mathiesen on a Meeting of Nordic Foreign Ministers in Stockholm"]

[Excerpts] "At today's meeting there was a discussion of international issues, including disarmament, the cooperation of East and West, the financial crisis of the United Nations and the situation in South Africa. Among the things discussed was a proposal, sanctioned by the Danish parliament on the third of April, that a committee of officials ought to be established to examine possibilities for making a proposal for a nordic nuclear-free zone. There was no agreement on this proposal, said Icelandic Foreign Minister Matthias A. Mathiesen in an interview with MORGUNBLADID reporters as he attended the meeting of Nordic foreign ministers in Stockholm yesterday.

"Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellermann-Jensen presented the proposal and explained the status of the proposal. The proposal, however, was sanctioned against the will of the Danish government," Mathiesen added. "During the discussions I reported on my views and referred in particular to the Althing resolution of 23 May, 1985, which was on the consideration of a nordic nuclear-free zone, from the Ural Mountains to the eastern shores of Greenland. And as emerged from the discussion of the chairman of the foreign affairs committee at that time, under consideration was a ban on nuclear weapons on the land, under the sea and in the air. There was to be agreement about this in a broad disarmament agreement with measures to reduce tensions."

Mathiesen said that he had reported at the meeting that there would be discussions next week in the Althing on foreign affairs and that he needed to take counsel with the Althing Foreign Affairs Committee and that it was not possible for him to take a position on the issue at this time. He said that a similar position had been taken by the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Sverre Strøm, who said that the Norwegian government had not discussed a new statement on the issue."

"Finland and Sweden said, on the other hand, that they could approve of the proposal but it was the case with all that various difficulties could arise from establishing operating rules for such a committee due to the dissimilar positions of nordic countries on security and defense matters," said Matthias A. Mathiesen, Icelandic Foreign Minister. The next meeting of nordic foreign ministers will be held late this summer in Copenhagen.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

HISTORY OF SOVIET BACKING FOR NORDIC NFZ

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 12, 18 Mar 86 p 2

[Article by G. Kartsev: "The Nuclear-Free North of Europe: Proponents and Opponents"]

[Text] The attitude of the Soviet Union to the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world evolves from the fundamental goals of its foreign policy, which is aimed at the prevention of a new world war and the lessening of military confrontation at any place on the planet.

-- Our country was the first to advance the concept of creating nuclear-free zones. We were also the first to advance a concrete initiative in this area. As long ago as 1956, at the United Nations, the USSR recommended creating in Central Europe a zone of arms limitation and inspection, and in particular the banning in that zone of nuclear military formations and any types of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

-- The Soviet Union played an important role in developing the first antinuclear agreement -- the 1959 International Treaty on Antarctica -- as well as the agreement concerning the nondeployment of nuclear weapons in space (1967), and the Treaty to Ban the Deployment on the Bottom of Seas and Oceans and in its Depths Nuclear Weapons and Other Types of Mass Destruction Weapons (1972).

-- The USSR rendered support to the Tlatelolco treaty concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America (1978) and the Avarua treaty concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean (1985).

The Soviet Union is in favor of assuring that any agreement concerning a nuclear-free zone will guarantee the conversion of the territories of the states participating in it into a zone that is completely free of nuclear weapons, and will preclude any possibilities of the violation of its nuclear-free status. The states participating in the zone must not produce or purchase nuclear weapons or any nuclear devices, and also must not attempt to obtain any direct or indirect control over them, must not allow the deployment or storage of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices on the territory of the zone, and must not allow the transporting of nuclear weapons

or nuclear explosive devices across the territory of the zone, including the entry into the ports located there of ships with nuclear weapons on board. The borders of the nuclear-free zones must be defined with a consideration of the generally accepted norms of international law, including the principle of the freedom of navigation in the open sea and in the straits used for international navigation.

Finland's Proposal

The approach of the Soviet Union toward the creation of this kind of zone in the North of Europe manifests itself clearly. It is interesting that the idea of the nuclear-free North was itself expressed for the first time by the USSR. In 1958 the Soviet government stated that the rejection of nuclear weapons by Denmark and Norway, as members of NATO, together with the lack of such weapons in Sweden and Finland, meant that there existed the prerequisites for turning Northern Europe as a whole into a zone that was free of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and that could be a serious guarantee for the preservation of peace and calm in the North of Europe.

Finnish President U. K. Kekkonen, speaking at a meeting of the Paasikivi Society on 28 May 1983, proposed creating in the North of Europe a zone that was free of nuclear weapons. At that time he remarked that the North European countries, factually speaking, were a nuclear-free zone. However, for the time being, that rested only on the position taken individually by each country. The consolidation of the existing situation by means of mutual agreements would not mean any changes in the policy being carried out by the northern countries, would not weaken their security, and would not harm the interests of any other state.

U. K. Kekkonen repeatedly returned to his proposal, calling for the creation of a treaty system that would, to the maximum degree, isolate the northern countries from the influence of nuclear strategy. A year and a half before the NATO decision to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe, he warned that the countries of Northern Europe would not be able to remain aloof if nuclear-missile weapons were used in Europe. The new president of Finland, Mauno Koivisto, has also confirmed his country's intention to apply efforts in favor of creating a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe.

In addition to its supporters, the idea of a nuclear-free North also found numerous opponents. The latter include the NATO countries, and primarily the United States. A negative attitude to it has also been taken by the official circles in other North European countries, including neutral Sweden. They have pointed to the mythical "Soviet threat," and have cited the so-called "argument" that the formation of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe would violate the balance of forces that has developed in that region, would create superiority for the USSR, etc.

This idea met a sympathetic response in the progressive, democratic circles in the countries of Northern Europe. Marching in the front ranks of the defenders of that idea were the Communists in those countries. Later on, it

received the support of the Social Democrats, and in trade-union, women's, and youth organizations.

The Soviet Union has come out unambiguously in favor of implementing Finland's proposal. As discussions ensued, there was also a refinement of the Soviet position with regard to this proposal. In October 1974 the Soviet Union stated that it was ready, together with the other nuclear powers, to act as the guarantor of the status of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe.

Real Plans

That position found confirmation in 1981. The USSR expressed its readiness to assume the pledge not to employ nuclear weapons against the North European countries that would become the participants in the nuclear-free zone. That guarantee by the USSR could have been formalized by means of the conclusion either of a multilateral agreement with its participation, or by means of bilateral agreements with each country participating in the zone.

At that time the USSR did not stipulate its pledges by a positive attitude toward that zone on the part of the other nuclear powers, although it is understandable that the participants in the zone would be in greater security if the guarantees for the respect of the nuclear-free status were also given by the NATO nuclear powers. The Soviet Union did not preclude the possibility of considering the question also of certain other measures as applicable to its own territory in the region adjacent to the nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe, and demonstrated its readiness to discuss that question with the interested countries.

Recently one has noted substantial shifts in the attitude of the North European countries to the idea of proclaiming their region to be a nuclear-free zone. Support for that idea is currently being rendered by the Social Democrat government in Sweden. Currently even the rightist circles in the North European countries can no longer simply brush off the discussion of aspects of this problem. It is very revealing that in this question Washington's position is also becoming ambiguous, although Washington continues to take a negative attitude toward the idea of the nuclear-free North.

The large changes in the approach to this problem are attested to by the conference of the parliamentarians of the North European countries on the question of the nuclear-free zone, which was held for the first time in Copenhagen on 29-30 November 1985. Its participants included more than 100 parliamentarians representing the political parties of those countries. The speakers at the conference included the prime ministers of Sweden and Finland, chairmen of the parliaments of Denmark, Norway, and Finland, and the ministers of foreign affairs of Denmark and Finland. The leaders of the Social Democrat parties of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland came to an understanding that they would strive for the creation of a North European working group that would include members of the parliaments of all the North European countries. Currently that group is working on the preparation of a new conference of parliamentarians in Norway, the government of which has come out more sharply

than the others against the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe. The Social Democrats have also supported the summons of the political parties of Finland to assure that the governments of the North European countries create a similar group on a state level. In the opinion of Finnish Prime Minister K. Sorsa, a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe can be created in the 1990's.

5075

CSO: 5200/1352

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

ICELAND'S LEADING NEWSPAPER ON GORBACHEV TEST BAN BID

Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID in Icelandic 2 Apr 86 p 32

[Editorial: "Complicated Disarmament Game"]

[Text] The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States have exchanged notes on nuclear weapons and disarmament around Easter. Mikhail Gorbachev proposed on television on Saturday evening that he and Ronald Reagan meet as soon as possible in some European city, for example London or Rome, to discuss a nuclear weapons test freeze. The President of the United States answered to the effect that he thought that a meeting of the two should deal with far more important issues affecting the relations of the two countries, and he hoped that Gorbachev would answer quickly the proposal of the United States that the two leaders meet in the United States in June. Yesterday a spokesman for the Soviet government said that a meeting of the two leaders in some European capital would not rule out the proposed trip of Gorbachev to Washington later in the year.

The statement of the Soviets that they will temporarily and unilaterally halt testing of nuclear weapons was first issued at the end of July, 1985, just at the time a meeting to note the decade since the signing of the Helsinki Accord was to begin. From the beginning this proposal was considered a propaganda ploy. Some think that it was made in order to increase the standing of the Soviet government in the minds of the public in Western countries, especially in Western Europe. The American government said immediately that the proposal was based upon the fact that the Soviet military machine is in the lead and does not need to test nuclear weapons for some time. A short while ago an American nuclear test took place in the Nevada desert. After that the Soviets reiterated their proposal for a nuclear tests band.

This exchange of notes on a nuclear test ban is only one part of the complicated game now being played in disarmament issues. People can argue about what effect they will have on the outcome of the game. But most experts are of the opinion that the dispute in this matter is more part of a psychological struggle than something which will determine the outcome of the game itself--although it is often difficult to establish a clear distinction between these things, as is well known.

It is worthy of consideration that attention is being directed more towards the dispute on a test ban than towards the fact that there has been movement towards an agreement on medium-ranged nuclear missiles. These weapons have been an eyesore for many during past years and the so-called peace movements began on account of American missiles, which have been transported to Western Europe. This 24 February the United States government made a proposal that the great powers remove their medium-ranged nuclear missiles from Europe and Asia before 1990. There are now 236 missiles of this kind in Great Britain, West Germany, Italy and Belgium and 441 in the Soviet Union. Each American missile contains one nuclear warhead and each Soviet missile three, that is, 1323 nuclear warheads are pointed at the neighbors of the Soviets in Europe and Asia.

It appears in general that the Soviets intend to stand by statements to the effect that they do not make it a precondition for agreement of medium-range missiles that the Americans give up their Star Wars plans. Britain and France hold firmly to earlier statements that their nuclear weapons do not fall under category medium-ranged weapons. There seems no longer to be disagreement about that.

Under discussion here is an affair which is a component in the disarmament game. The talk about a test ban, however, seems to have drawn more interest. Why? Is the reason the same reason why the news department of Icelandic State Radio reported in unceasing communications about the meetings of military base opponents and their collaborators in the peace movement here in Iceland? It was not only the radio news department which heeded this local Easter meeting. They were covered in state radio programing on both channels. All the hubbub recalls the storm that was made on radio about the Keflavik marches, before they petered out for lack of interest.

It could be heard on foreign broadcasting stations around Easter that Gorbachev's television address on the Saturday before Easter was a part of the Soviet support for the peace movements, which served, around the holiday, to protest against western defense. Widely around the Western world it is not only churches and orchestras "misleading publicity" in the mass media during the holy days and festival of the rising from the dead. Gorbachev the international pacifist was present to reassure those who believe they have a monopoly on peace, and who control peace. Icelandic State Radio directed the attention of its listeners carefully to meetings of the opposition of peace here in Iceland over the weekend.

As has been said, however, it is a hard question to draw military between the additional or rather a different approach and for the sake of the people who want to see a disarmament of the world. It is a hard question to get to the bottom of the matter and it is a hard question to get to the bottom of the matter.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

HIGH RADIOACTIVITY LEVEL AFTER 10 APRIL NEVADA TEST NOTED

LD150813 Moscow TASS in English 0801 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] New York, May 15, TASS--Dangerous radioactive levels have been recorded 80 kilometers from the Nevada testing range following an underground nuclear explosion there on April 10, the U.S. news agencies UPI and AP reported, quoting an official spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy.

The atmosphere remained contaminated there until late April.

The nuclear test, codenamed Mighty Oak, was designed to try out new kinds of U.S. arms, including space weapons. During the blast an emission of radioactive substances occurred and scientists have not been able to this day to determine what went wrong.

According to the Department of Energy's spokesman, two test site workers suffered radioactive exposure. The explosion destroyed electronic equipment worth \$20 million.

The spokesman said the mishap might cause delays in the United States' testing of new weaponry for efficiency.

It is thus only 35 days after the nuclear blast in Nevada that U.S. authorities admitted the consequences it has had--a fact illustrating graphically enough their attitude to keeping their people informed.

Yet at the same time a malevolent campaign has been maintained in the United States all these days over the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

This bears out once again the obvious political goals of the outcry, which have been to throw up extra impediments to West-East dialogue and sow more seeds of distrust of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

END

100- 000000 113

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

AMTTS

AUSTRALIA: NUCLEAR-FREE TREATY--Australia's foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, has predicted that enough countries will formally endorse the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty for it to be registered with the United Nations. Speaking in the Tongan capital, Nuku'alofa, Mr Hayden said eight countries would have to formally endorse the treaty for this to happen. So far, nine countries have signed the treaty: Australia, Papua New Guinea, Cook Islands, Fiji, New Zealand, Kiribati, Niue, Tuvalu, and Western Samoa. However, only three have formally endorsed it: Fiji, Cook Islands, and Niue. Vanuatu has said it will not endorse the treaty because its conditions are not strong enough. This leaves Nauru, Solomon Islands, and Tonga still in doubt out of the 13 South Pacific Forum countries. Mr Hayden said Tonga's foreign and defense minister, Prince Tupoua's had expressed concern about some aspects of the treaty during talks today. However, he would not give details of what the Tongan minister had said. Mr Hayden is on a 2-day official visit to Tonga, the 11th stop on his 2-week tour of the South Pacific. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English ORU] [MT 19 May 86 BR] /6662

CSO: 5209/4379

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. USES 'VERIFICATION PROBLEM' TO BLOCK AGREEMENTS

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 16, 15 Apr 86 pp 1-2

[Article by A. Podberezkin and A. Chapis, candidates of historical sciences, under rubric "Let's Analyze It": "Arms Control: Two Positions"]

[Text] Among the broad complex of recent Soviet foreign-political initiative, the attention of world public opinion and the governments of various countries has rightfully been attracted to the bold proposals made by the USSR in the area of verifying the means of limiting and discontinuing the arms race. And that is understandable, because until the present time Western propaganda has been spreading the myth far and wide to the effect that one of the chief obstacles on the path of limiting and discontinuing the arms race, and especially complete disarmament, is the "Soviet Union's lack of desire to consider effective methods of verification."

It is indicative that this "argument" is dragged out each time and is intensively whipped up out of proportions at precisely the moment when the United States needs to block the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union in the area of disarmament.

-- Suffice it to recall that the "verification problem" was put into the category of the ones that are difficult to overcome when the question arose as to whether the United States should follow the example of the USSR and introduce a moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

-- The same "problem" is used as the pretext for discrediting the decision made by the USSR on a unilateral basis to reduce the [number of] medium-range missiles.

-- Behind the screen of the "imperfection" of the verification measures, the United States has repeatedly torpedoed the agreements that were already concluded (SALT-I, SALT-II, etc.).

The most recent
shattered the many
this [unclear]
limiting the arms

[unclear] which [unclear] verification [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

As M. S. Gorbachev stated in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th party congress, "...the USSR is open for verification. We have a self-interest in it no less than others do. All-encompassing verification of the strictest kind is probably the most important element in the disarmament process. The crux of the matter, as we see it, lies in the following: disarmament without verification is impossible, but verification without disarmament also makes no sense."

How the Approaches By the USSR and the United States to the Verification Problem Differ

U.S. position

One of the typical features of the American "verification concept" is the attempt to represent the matter as though a number of arms areas and systems do not lend themselves to verification at all. And if that is so, then a search for mutually advantageous agreements in the area of disarmament is a matter without any prospects, a matter that is simply hopeless. Thus the United States, ahead of time, removes from the framework of the negotiations those questions the positive resolution of which would contradict the aggressive military-political course of the United States.

Soviet position

For the sake of justice we might note that the verification problem in a number of instances actually is not a simple one. And so the Soviet Union has always shown its readiness to take part in the search for generally acceptable understandings relative to a particular verification system on a compromise basis. However, despite the entire complexity of the scientific-technical component of the verification problem, this is a question that is not so much technical as it is political, and it must be resolved chiefly by political means. Deliberately overexaggerating the technical difficulties linked with verification means previously blocking the possible resolutions. This is precisely the unworthy action that the United States constantly resorts to.

Let us now consider a specific example. Let us take the very critical problem of preventing the arms race in space. When, in 1984, the USSR proposed a discussion of this question on a bilateral basis, the United States announced that it would not enter into negotiations until reliable methods were found for verifying the fulfillment of the possible understandings.

If one approaches this extremely important problem with similar reservations, the matter, of course, does not lead to any results.

The scientific-technical means make it possible to verify the fulfillment of the terms of anti-satellite weapons. As for the verification of a negotiation on space military weapons, the verification can be carried out by the use of existing means that have already been used.

The verification of other systems, if it is carried out by the use of existing means, can also be carried out.

Ocean, and in space. This is especially true with respect to the banning of space strike systems, because we are talking about banning that small amount that has already been created. Tomorrow, as has been suggested by experience, it will be much more difficult to do this.

The Soviet Union has persistently tried to convince the United States that the chief function of verification is to promote the carrying out of measures to limit and to discontinue the arms race. It must reinforce the trust that the sides have in one another on the basis of objective information about the real state of affairs in the fulfillment of a particular agreement. But this is possible only provided that the volume and methods of verification correspond to the nature and volume of the specific understandings. Verification without the working out of specific measures for arms limitation loses its meaning and can be converted only into a means of intelligence, and this, properly speaking, is what the United States is attempting to achieve.

Let us take another example. Let us consider the problem of banning chemical weapons, because the U.S. position in this question consists in opening up for "verification" only the state chemical industry. In the USSR, as everyone knows, the entire chemical industry is a state industry, and, in accordance with the U.S. proposal, would become "transparent" for the American verification personnel. But practically the entire chemical industry in the United States is in the hands of the private sector and it would prove to be closed to verification on the part of the USSR.

What is concealed behind the principle of "transparency"? This principle is employed by Washington as a multipurpose means for also blocking other disarmament negotiations. Thus, at the Vienna negotiations dealing with the reduction of the armed forces and arms in Central Europe, the United States asked to have revealed the size, nature of activity, and organizational structure of the USSR armed forces and the places of their deployment, in other words, it asked for the rejection of all kinds of military "secrets."

What, then, is offered in exchange? The USSR, according to the proposal made by the Western countries, could verify the military activity only within the confines of Europe. The territory of the United States, naturally, is excluded from all-encompassing verification for the simple reason that everything is already known to the Soviet Union, because the United States, they say, is an open society and the Soviet experts can find out practically everything about U.S. military activity by reading the yellow press!

What has been stated attests to the fact that behind all this is the obvious lack of desire on the part of Washington to bind itself by any limitations that would hinder the further buildup and qualitative improvement of arms for the attainment of its clear superiority over the countries in the world. It is impossible to evaluate in any other way the policy of the United States.

Why, today, does any unprejudiced observer say that the bold steps taken by the USSR have put an end to the use of the verification problems as a deterrent to Soviet-American negotiations?

The USSR has stated completely unambiguously that it sees absolutely no obstacles in the approach to verification and is ready to take any -- and we emphasize, any -- verification measures if they will promote the limitation of the arms race.

First. The Soviet Union has again proposed coming to an understanding with the United States to assure on a mutual basis the prevention of all nuclear explosions, that is, to shut off reliably all the channels for improving nuclear weapons. The proper monitoring of the observance of the moratorium, in the opinion of the USSR, will be completely guaranteed by the national technical means, and also by means of international procedures. In the necessary instances, inspection will be carried out locally.

Moreover, the Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to take advantage of the well-known proposal by the leaders of six states -- if that proposal is acceptable by the other side -- concerning the rendering of assistance in verifying the discontinuation of nuclear tests, including inspections locally.

Second. The Soviet proposals that deal with monitoring of the agreements to prevent the arms race in space are far-reaching. The Soviet Union is in favor of assuring that the ban on striking space means encompassing all stages in the conception of this new class of arms, which, however, does not affect fundamental research in space.

At the same time the USSR feels that it is inadmissible, in the guise of carrying out tests and research, to conduct projects of a military nature outside of the laboratory -- the creation and testing of experimental models, individual assemblies and components, mockups and prototypes of space arms.

It is necessary to ban everything that is being done to carry out the further designing and production of striking space systems as is being done in the United States.

This military activity, according to the firm conviction of the USSR, lends itself completely to verification with the aid of the national technical means (satellites, radar stations, and other radio-technical means). Taking into consideration the fact that the West has already found "counterarguments" against this system of verification, the Soviet Union has taken a new, bold step -- it has proposed the establishment of the most rigid verification, including the opening up of the appropriate laboratories for inspections. Naturally, this will be carried out for purposes of preventing the arms race in space, rather than for purposes of monitoring that race.

Third. The Soviet Union has come forward with a proposal to accelerate the negotiations dealing with the conclusion of an effective and verifiable international convention to ban space weapons and to eliminate the existing reserves of those weapons. The final goal is the complete and rapid and

complete elimination of these weapons, as well as the industrial base for manufacturing them.

We are also ready to guarantee the prompt announcement of the locations of the enterprises engaged in the production of chemical weapons and the cessation of production of them, to begin developing procedures for eliminating the existing production base, and also to begin, after the convention goes into effect, the elimination of the reserves of chemical weapons.

All this, in accordance with the proposal of the USSR, would be strictly monitored, once again, including international inspections locally.

Fourth. The Soviet Union has come forward with new proposals concerning verification also as applicable to the negotiations in Vienna. This is especially important currently, when one can discern certain signs of the possibility of achieving a compromise resolution concerning the reduction of the Soviet and American troops and the subsequent freezing of the level of the armed forces of the groupings opposing one another in the center of Europe.

The USSR has stated in a completely definite manner that, in addition to the national technical means, the pledge to freeze the number of troops could also be verified with the aid of the permanently operating system for monitoring the entry of absolutely any military contingents into the reduction zone.

It is also proposed to exchange the lists of the military units to be reduced, to give reciprocal notification of the beginning and completion of the reduction, and to have each side create three or four points for observing the withdrawal of the troops to be reduced.

Fifth. In advancing a specific program for nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union is aware that its implementation requires the appropriate verification means. These are extremely difficult questions that are linked with the interests of national security, and this is one of the reasons for the deeply felt self-interestedness of the USSR in reliable verification. Therefore the policy of the Soviet government is consistently aimed at the search for those forms, methods, and means of verification which would assure the guaranteed and safe movement ahead along the path of disarmament.

Despite the great importance of the problem of verification measures, it is absolutely incomparable with the danger that the arms race represents to mankind. This is the reason why the USSR is not allowing a stumbling block on the path of arms reduction. The USSR is ready to undertake any and every step which is necessary for the achievement of the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union.

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA: CHERNOBYL HIGHLIGHTS URGENCY OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

PM211017 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 86 First Edition p 4

[N. Prozhogin article: "An Act of Statesmanship: That Is the Way the World Is Responding to the Extension of the Soviet Moratorium"]

[Text] The accident at the Chernobyl AES has sounded the alarm once again for all mankind. It is still not too late for this to be realized. But certain political circles in the West, which have used the accident at Chernobyl as a pretext to launch a particularly shameful--given the tragic nature of the event--anti-Soviet campaign, have not realized, or pretend not to have realized this point. It has been used as another attempt to discredit Soviet policy and sow seeds of distrust regarding its peace initiatives.

Nevertheless, the event in Chernobyl should serve as a new terrible warning to all--a warning about the destructive force that nuclear power can be if it gets out of control. It should not be forgotten here that in today's interdependent world there are, in addition to problems of the peaceful use of the atom, problems of the military use of the atom. And it is the latter--problems of the military use--that are the main ones today. After all, no matter how great the disaster in Chernobyl actually was, it is quite simply incommensurable with the scale of the thousands upon thousands of catastrophes contained right now in the nuclear arsenals. And yet nuclear explosions aimed at further improving and creating [sozdaniye] new kinds of these lethal weapons continue. A veritable abyss will open up before mankind if a nuclear war is unleashed. The conclusions are obvious. Yes, it is necessary to establish reliable international cooperation in the peaceful use of the atom. But above all it is essential to step up efforts in the struggle against nuclear tests and for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Those are precisely the conclusions drawn by the Soviet Union.

There is no discrepancy between word and deed in our country, and political conclusions are combined with specific, constructive actions.

Appearing on Soviet television on 16 May, M.S. Gorbachev announced that our government made the decision to extend the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 August of this year. This, let us be honest, was no simple decision, given that the United States is continuing to build up its nuclear missile arsenal and is implementing major military programs, including the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." But the Soviet Union cannot

the decision in light of all the circumstances connected with the security of our people and all mankind.

The Soviet Union has thus again demonstrated its goodwill and intention to use every opportunity to influence the other side's stance by force of peace-loving example rather than by force of arms. Here the Soviet Union had urged the U.S. Administration to consider with the utmost responsibility the extent of the danger looming over mankind and to subscribe to the opinion of the world community, which demands an end to nuclear tests.

This demand has also been repeatedly expressed at the most diverse levels. It has been formulated in UN General Assembly decisions; in appeals to the U.S. and USSR leaders by the leaders of the six states from various continents-- Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden; in statements by eminent Nobel laureate scientists; and in declarations and petitions by numerous international and national antiwar and antinuclear organizations and conferences.

It is not difficult to imagine the enthusiasm with which millions upon millions of people in all countries would welcome a meeting between the CPSU general secretary and the U.S. President for the purpose of resolving the specific question of banning nuclear tests--a question of concern to everyone.

The speech given by M.S. Gorbachev on 14 May reaffirmed the proposal for such an urgent meeting. The meeting could be held in the capital of any European state ready to receive the USSR and U.S. leaders. It could also be held in Hiroshima.

...Hiroshima, 6 August. The world remembers that on that day in 1945, Hiroshima was struck by an atomic bomb which, together with the bomb dropped on Nagasaki, killed hundreds of thousands. Last year, on the 45th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, the Soviet Union introduced a significant modification of all nuclear explosions. It has now extended the prohibition to 6 August, thus symbolizing, in the highest sense of the word, its attitude to a conflict-free world mutually ensuring sufficient existence and well-being. It is to be hoped, and will also inspire other socialist states to follow the good example, will achieve on Hiroshima itself.

However, the polynomial \tilde{p} is not in $\mathbb{R}[x]$ (the real numbers). The real \tilde{p} is in $\mathbb{R}[x]$ if and only if $\tilde{p}(x) = p(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. But $\tilde{p}(i) = 0$ and $p(i) = 1$, so $\tilde{p}(x) \neq p(x)$ for $x = i$. Thus \tilde{p} is not in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. The polynomial \tilde{p} is in $\mathbb{C}[x]$ (the complex numbers) if and only if $\tilde{p}(x) = p(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C}$. We have $\tilde{p}(i) = 0$ and $p(i) = 1$, so $\tilde{p}(x) \neq p(x)$ for $x = i$. Thus \tilde{p} is not in $\mathbb{C}[x]$.

message to M.S. Gorbachev from Prof. B. Lown. On behalf of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, an international movement which unites in its ranks doctors from 41 countries, he describes the Soviet Government's decision as "an act of unprecedented statesmanship" and assures us that the world's physicians will make every effort to persuade the U.S. administration to do the same. Thus, it is once again up to the U.S. side. Let those who lead the United States show their concern for people's lives and health in deeds rather than in the words which they declaim so frequently, loudly, and even stridently. If the U.S. administration would only respond to the Soviet initiative and take that step the people of the world expect of it, the potential for ridding the planet of nuclear tests would become a reality.

Unfortunately, Washington's line so far does not hold out much hope that they will heed the voice of the people and the demands of reason. Throughout last summer, fall, winter, and this spring, the present U.S. administration has continued nuclear explosions in Nevada. And this despite the fact that the U.S. President signed in Geneva a Soviet-American joint statement enshrining the acknowledgment that there can be no winner in a nuclear war and that such a war must never be started.

...The 20 April issue of the Italian weekly PANORAMA carries a correspondent's report on a visit to the nuclear test range in Nevada. The journalist did not restrict himself to describing who in the United States is preparing a nuclear apocalypse for mankind and the way it is being done. The reportage ends with a conversation with the leader of an American public organization waging an on-the-spot struggle, backed by the country's doctors and scientists, to end nuclear tests in Nevada. The organization is called Citizens Alert [Grazhdanskaya trevoga] and its leader is Bill Vincent. Asked whether he hoped that the organization he headed would be able to stop the American nuclear test machine, Vincent replied: "We have little hope with the present administration. Perhaps all we can hope is that we do not all blow ourselves sky-high..." Yes, judging by all accounts, it is not to be expected that the present U.S. administration, blinded by illusions of attaining military superiority, will readily end nuclear tests. WASHINGTON may not even hide its negative attitude toward the new Soviet initiative.

However, the realization of the nuclear war danger is a direct result of the political thinking which has been followed by the administration. The present U.S. administration, irrespective of the fact that it is a party to the Geneva agreement, cannot expect to achieve its goals by continuing the present policy. The only way to achieve the goal of ending nuclear tests is by changing the present policy. The only way to achieve the goal of ending nuclear tests is by changing the present policy. The only way to achieve the goal of ending nuclear tests is by changing the present policy.

For the first time in the history of the United States...

to the United States...

to the United States...

to the United States...

to the United States...

to the United States...

Soviet proposals on completely eliminating nuclear weapons, ending nuclear explosions, and creating an all-embracing international security system are in accord with the implacably strict demands which the nuclear age makes on the political leadership of all (yes, all) countries.

It is a course our country will continue to pursue unwaveringly.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1371

RELATED ISSUES

IZVESTIYA HOLDS SOVIET-U.S. DISCUSSION ON NUCLEAR DANGER

PM191526 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 May 86 Morning Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA Roundtable Discussion" between Raymond Garthoff, "U.S. scientist from the Brookings Institution (Washington), author of book on U.S.-Soviet relations, and well known diplomat," and Doctor of Historical Sciences Andrey Kokoshin, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute and deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against The Nuclear Threat; chaired by Candidate of Historical Sciences and IZVESTIYA correspondent Sergey Chugrov: "Demand of the Nuclear Age"--first paragraph is an IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The attempts to erect additional barriers across the path of the development of the already difficult East-West dialogue and the desire to justify the arms race have been given new scope in the capitalist countries, and primarily in the United States, in connection with the Chernobyl AEE- [Atomic Energy Station] accident. "We perceived this tragedy in a completely different fashion," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said in his 14 May speech on Soviet television. "We understand that this is yet another warning, yet another terrifying warning that the nuclear age demands new political thinking and a new policy." Certain aspects of political thinking in the nuclear age were the subject of a conversation between a U.S. political scientist who came to our country at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences and an eminent Soviet scientist specializing in studies of the international situation.

[illegible]

Remember how, still in the not too distant past, many countries could ensure their own security at the expense of other states. Now--and this is the paradox--destructive power is no longer capable of guaranteeing a single state's national security at the expense of another. The powers must coexist if they want to exist at all.

[Chugrov] We have already experienced a period of detente, which demonstrated the growth of political realism, in our mutual relations with the United States.

[Kokoshin] Unfortunately, in leading political circles in the West realism makes headway with great difficulty, through a series of zigzags, ebbs, and flows. Influential forces in the West did everything possible to ensure that the period of detente in the seventies lasted a relatively short period. The following contrast is typical of them: either detente or the ensuring of national security. Moreover, they speculated on the term national security, using it in its chauvinistic sense.

[Garthoff] I agree, there was a logical error there. In actual fact, the antithesis of detente is not national security but international tension.

[Kokoshin] I think that the time has come for people across the ocean to accept the situation of "nuclear parity." The approximate parity in nuclear arms raises doubts about the use of military force as an instrument of policy and thus leads logically to the abandonment of the idea of the further development of military equipment. Especially in view of the fact that a kind of law of "diminishing returns" operates in the strategic balance sphere. In other words, the increasingly growing investment of resources in armaments produces an increasingly diminishing effect from the viewpoint of the correlation of forces. This correlation remains virtually unchanged; the only thing that occurs is an increase in the arsenals for the multiple destruction of all living things.

[Garthoff] In the prevailing situation it is the Soviet Union and the United States, which possess enormous arsenals of nuclear weapons, that bear the primary responsibility for our fragile peace. This is precisely why they must not hurl accusations at each other but must take steps that would insure us against the evolution of crises into clashes and would consolidate strategic stability.

[Kokoshin] Your words, Professor Garthoff, echo the thesis about the equal responsibility of the "superpowers," which is a favorite with many U.S. political scientists. But it is none other than the Soviet Union that puts forward broad program of constructive and bold proposals while Washington relies on halfway measures. The following is one of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of the nuclear age: The elimination of the threat that civilization may perish demands disarmament instead of arms control.

[Garthoff] Correct. We must mutually reduce the stockpiles of weapons instead of building them up. In addition to that, however, what is needed is a stable dialogue between our countries: Depending on circumstances, identical nuclear arsenals cast different shadows.

[Kokoshin] It is accepted that the interrelationship between the political, purely military, and military-technical aspects is sufficiently broad. It is important to admit that the arms buildup does not strengthen but, on the contrary, diminishes strategic stability. Recognition of the need to reduce nuclear weapons on the basis of equal security is a very important step. But many champions of even mutually acceptable reductions of nuclear arsenals in the West are hesitant to take the second step: While admitting the need to reduce arms, they either ignore the problem of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons or argue in general terms that, without nuclear weapons, peace will become less stable.

It is very important to acknowledge that nuclear war is impermissible, but this acknowledgement must be backed by specific proposals; having said "A," it is necessary to say "B." Nevertheless, there have been no constructive proposals by Washington. Furthermore, with its political zigzags, the present U.S. leadership is devaluing, if not totally negating, the declarations about the impermissibility of war and is increasing the risk of a slide toward nuclear conflict.

[Garthoff] The risk of a premeditated nuclear clash is, I imagine, virtually zero. I can even say it more definitely: I am convinced that there is no real likelihood of such a war.

[Chugrov] Why then do people consider this a real danger and struggle against it?

[Garthoff] Tension in relations is fraught with the risk that an accidental or unsanctioned war may be started, particularly under the conditions of an acute international crisis. Imagine, for example, an exacerbation of the situation in some part of the world, take into account the possibility of the headlong development of events into a critical situation or incorrect interpretation of each other's intentions by the sides in conflict, and add the likelihood of technical malfunctions in the systems for early warning against missile attacks, control, and communications.

Therefore, taking all these considerations into account, we must admit that the threat of a large-scale collision is permanently hanging over the world in which we are living.

[Kokoshin] Personally, professor, as a technically educated person, I am inclined to agree with your opinion about the likelihood of a nuclear war being started by accident. Blind faith in the infallibility of equipment must not be a characteristic feature of the new thinking of which we are speaking. At the same time, I cannot agree with you that there is no possibility of a premeditated nuclear conflict arising. Unfortunately, an analysis of many documents and elaborations by right-wing U.S. military theoreticians testifies that forces exist in the United States that plan to be the first to use nuclear weapons, including at the early stages of an armed conflict. I also have in mind the concepts of "limited" nuclear war and "protracted" nuclear war, and the delivery of "measured," "controllable," and "surgical" nuclear strikes.

[Garthoff] But Soviet strategic thinking also contains similar elements....

[Kokoshin] Unfortunately, you have an incorrect impression of this question. Soviet military doctrine includes the rejection of the first use of nuclear weapons. It is based on realistic views of the nature and character of nuclear war and rejects the idea of a nuclear war being "limited" as inconsistent and exceptionally dangerous. At the same time, however, the USSR and its allies are forced to take U.S. concepts of this kind into account in the building of armed forces and in the development of military-political theory. Here is why. Until the onset of the nuclear age, the adoption of inconsistent schemes to wage war by a given state primarily meant the danger that this state would suffer a cruel defeat. This was advantageous to its enemies. Today this has to be approached differently. If a country's leadership arms itself with concepts which disregard the real nature of modern war, it inevitably dooms not just its own people and allies to inevitable destruction. It can cast the whole of mankind into the abyss.

[Chugrov] How can we draw away from the dangerous brink?

[Garthoff] It is obviously necessary to strengthen mutual understanding. If we want to live, we must seek more and more new opportunities to reduce the number of issues on which misunderstandings exist.

I believe that last November's summit meeting in Geneva marked the beginning of this process. A real improvement in relations between the two countries and reciprocal recognition of each other's interests cannot, of course, result from one single meeting between the two countries' leaders or from meetings held as the occasion may warrant. This, I think, is a protracted and complex process.

[Chugrov] Looking into the future, what would you wish your descendants, who will have to live in the 21st Century?

[Garthoff] First of all, I would wish them existence. Second, the creation of an environment that would provide all conditions for progress and for man's perfection.

[Kokoshin] My wish would be that their vocabulary would not contain expressions like "balance of fear" and "assured destruction." That they would be able to see models of nuclear weapons only as museum exhibits.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1371

RELATED ISSUES

USSR PAPER HOSTS ROUNDTABLE ON TEST BAN, NUCLEAR WINTER, SDI

PM301020 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 86 p 3

[Report by P. Vedenyapin, A. Novikov, and Yu. Popv: "Twilight at Noon?"]

[Text] At about 4 o'clock on that day people began gathering outside the White Room in the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial offices: scientists, journalists, and quite young guys--pupils of Moscow schools and students of VUZ's in the capital. They had all come at the invitation of the editorial board and the USSR Youth Organizations Committee to participate in a roundtable discussion organized by us on the subject of "the Arms Race and the Struggle for Peace." Let us introduce the roundtable participants: Candidate of Historical Sciences V.F. Davydov, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada; Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu.V. Katasonov, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada; Doctor of Historical Sciences G.S. Khozin, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada; and Candidate of Mathematicophysical Sciences G.L. Stenchikov, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Computer Center. However, not only Soviet scientists spoke in the course of our discussion. With the help of A. Drozdov and A. Petruk, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's own correspondents in Tokyo and New York respectively, and TASS correspondent A. Lyutyy (Washington), foreign specialists were also able to participate--from a distance, it is true--in the roundtable discussion.

V.F. Davydov: To understand why the problem of ending all nuclear tests has ended up at the center of world politics, it is necessary to know that they are conducted exclusively to modernize existing mass destruction weapons and to create [sozdavat] new generations of them. The Soviet Union does not strive for this, and that is why on 6 August last year it announced the introduction of a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow its example. The United States refused. Why? It put forward several arguments to account for this.

First, according to the Pentagon, such tests are needed to verify the reliability of the charges now in existence. However, this is nothing more than a rouse. According to the majority of the physicists who were involved in the program to develop American nuclear weapons, these tests were necessary only at the initial stage of their creation, and then the need for them fell away.

Why? Because it was established that the nuclear explosive with which warheads are filled does not spoil or lose its properties with the passage of time. These charges can be used at any time.

Second, champions of nuclear explosions claim that tests cannot be banned without a reliable system of verification [kontrol], and the Soviet Union is unyielding on this issue. However, this claim too proved to be nothing more than a pretext which the administration needed to get out of concluding a treaty banning nuclear explosions. And this became obvious after our country declared that we will agree to any forms of verification [kontrol]. After that the administration could only go over to overt demagoguery. And now Washington declares that nuclear weapons are an element of deterrence and a factor for peace, and so it is necessary to further improve them, build up the number of warheads, and test them.

Another aspect of this problem. According to official data alone, there have been more than 800 disasters in the United States connected with nuclear weapons. And the latest disaster was with a Pershing in West Germany! All this shows once again that the world has approached the point where the fate of our planet could be decided by any technical malfunction, by a single absurd fortuity.

So, can mankind develop normally under such conditions? No, it cannot, all people capable of objective thought and sensible reasoning reply. It cannot, because this is amoral and immoral. And it will not be able to until nuclear weapons are removed from the face of the earth.

In that case another question is logical: Why does public opinion not work, why can it not make the U.S. administration end nuclear explosions? For the White House, crudely speaking, takes absolutely no notice of the initiatives addressed to it! A well-known Western medical scientist had a very graphic answer to this question: "The antinuclear movement," he said, "is now at a stage comparable with the boiling of water in a beaker. At first it seems undisturbed, but the critical moment arrives and suddenly the water starts boiling." You will recall how a group of people made their way onto the Nevada test site to prevent another nuclear test. What was that: a crazy escapade by fanatical pacifists? No, it was a step of desperation, an extreme measure. It was an act by people who had finally lost faith in any goodwill on the part of their administration. Sober-minded people are ready to do anything to put a straitjacket on the nuclear arms race and its apologists.

Incidentally, the American refusal to subscribe to the moratorium was seen as a sign of encouragement by those countries which are not abandoning hope of creating nuclear weapons or which have already created them in secret: the Republic of South Africa, Pakistan, Israel, and so forth. We know that in the seventies, when both the United States and other countries were actively conducting nuclear tests, a bright flash was recorded in the region of the Cape of Good Hope. Many experts believe that it was a test of a nuclear device conducted by the Republic of South Africa. Specialists also believe that Pakistan could also be on the point of conducting nuclear tests. And yet, if a total nuclear test ban treaty existed between Moscow and Washington, not

only those countries but even, I believe, France would not dare to conduct tests. Thus, not just Soviet-U.S. relations but the future of the entire international community are at stake. [Davydov ends] Washington was on the line. David (Khestetter), coordinator of the Washington Peace Center, joined in the roundtable discussion: The goal of all honest Americans is a world without nuclear weapons. Enough have been stockpiled on the planet to destroy the world many times over. How is disarmament to be achieved? It seems to us that the ending of nuclear weapon tests must be the first, obligatory step on this path. If these tests stop, the modernization of the nuclear arsenals of states possessing atomic weapons will also cease.

It is a pity the Reagan administration did not subscribe to the Soviet moratorium. Unfortunately, on the issue of limiting nuclear arms the White House does not heed the voice of the majority of Americans. Such a development of events is fraught with great danger to life on earth. I would like to hope that common sense will prevail and will prompt our administration to act sensibly. I am sure that the struggle of the peace-loving public in the United States itself will also play its positive role in this.

G.L. Stenchikov: I must stipulate straightaway that I deal with mathematics or, more accurately, I work in the [hardly indistinct] where mathematics and physics meet. But it so happens that the results of my research and of that of my colleagues could apparently be an argument in the struggle for peace. Our work boils down, in particular, to a study of how nuclear war might influence the planet's climate.

For a long time scientists believed that just radioactive contamination might be the chief long-term consequence of a nuclear war. But then in 1982 two scientists--one West German and one American--published a work examining other, no less dangerous consequences of nuclear explosions. That book was called "Twilight at Noon," and you will understand why from what I am about to say. We know that in the stratosphere there is an ozone layer which is a screen protecting all life on earth from deadly ultraviolet radiation. We also know that powerful explosions in the atmosphere lead to the formation of a tremendous quantity of nitrogen dioxide, which influences the reactions that cause this layer to be maintained. So, engaged on investigating this problem, the book's authors ascertained that a large-yield nuclear explosion carried out in the atmosphere can make a "hole" in the ozone layer with a radius of 10 km. And this in turn will lead to many terrible consequences--intensified reproduction of pathogenic bacteria, and so forth.

The second danger posed to the planet's atmosphere by the use of nuclear weapons is the numerous fires. The average density of fuel in forests is 20 kg per square meter; it is twice that in cities, while in city centers it is tens or hundreds of times greater than in a forest. Moreover, the fuel in cities is high-molecular: plastics and so forth. So, hundreds of millions of metric tons of smoke and soot would be discharged into the atmosphere simultaneously as a result of the fires, and this would be sufficient to hide the sun and cause "twilight at noon." That is, solar radiation would be reduced thousands of times at the earth's surface--which would cause abrupt climatic changes.

During World War II hundreds of thousands of square kilometers of dwellings were burned down, but only 3-4 megatons of explosives were used then. And now nuclear arsenals comprise 12,000-18,000 megatons.

Our calculations are based on all these data. We fed into our model the possible intensive pollution of the Northern Hemisphere, introduced equations describing the drift of pollution on the winds and the washing out of soot, and endeavored to calculate the temperature patterns formed as a result. It turned out that over the course of 6-10 days the temperature at the center of continents could fall by tens of degrees. After 2-3 weeks these temperature minimums would move toward coastal regions. The temperature in polluted areas would drop by an average of approximately 20 degrees, and then the dirt would start moving into the Southern Hemisphere.

This situation would continue for approximately 2 months, and the resultant sharp and prolonged cooling could cause very many ecological systems on the earth to perish. Forests would perish, and a tremendous amount of harmful chemicals and oxides would be given off during fierce fires and, falling with rain, would lead to salinization of the soil and prolonged loss of its fertility.

Thus, if a nuclear war were to happen in our planet's climate it would result in global pernicious--and largely irreversible--changes. [Stenchikov ends] Under pressure from Washington, which is seeking to involve its military-political allies in the process of implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative," the British and FRG governments have given their official consent to involvement in the SDI program. The United States also expects the same of Japan. Tokyo has not yet given an unambiguous reply to the White House's "tempting" offer. Why? (Kharuo Fudzii), a specialist on military issues, ponders this: As yet the Japanese Government's official stand on the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is contained in the sentence: "We take an understanding attitude to SDI." Of course, this is not enough for the United States. "Understanding" will not provide the program with Japanese technology and Japanese finance, without which Washington will evidently find it difficult to implement SDI even in conjunction with its West European allies.

What are the reasons why the Liberal Democratic Party government does not give an unambiguous reply to the U.S. proposal to subscribe to the "star wars" program? It is very regrettable, but they can only be described as reasons of expediency. The ruling party is in no hurry, since in June it is proposed to hold elections to the upper chamber of parliament. Making Washington a promise right now would mean laying itself open to sharp public criticism--which is fraught with the loss of seats in parliament during the upcoming elections. The private sector of Japanese industry, which will shoulder the chief burden of technological and financial injections into SDI, is also experiencing a certain vacillation. Businessmen are loath to part with their firms' money and secrets. But on the whole, in my view, the Japanese Government is ready to confirm its obligations to the United States as an ally this time too, on the question of SDI. It is just a question of the timing.

In their approach to SDI the Japanese conservatives show understanding of U.S. nuclear strategy, which, to judge from the widely known views of Pentagon theoreticians, presupposes victory even in a nuclear war. And, Washington believes, SDI, which is passed off as a space shield which the United States intends to raise over Japan too, will help to ensure that victory. We Japanese have had quite enough of the "nuclear umbrella" which the Americans opened over the Japanese islands. I, too, deeply doubt its "protective" function.

The reaching of comprehensive accords on questions of nuclear disarmament can be the only sensible alternative to SDI. The Soviet Union sets a worthy example in this respect. The stubborn U.S. reluctance to support the peace-loving Soviet initiatives is inexplicable from commonsense positions.

G.S. Khozin: One of Washington's chief theses designed to justify the need to implement the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and its "humaneness" is the thesis of the supposedly exclusively defensive nature of SDI. That is a blatant lie! SDI is, above all, a qualitatively new stage of the arms race, an attempt to ensure a one-sided advantage for the American side with all the ensuring military consequences. The recent nuclear explosions on the Nevada range serve, above all, the aims of implementing SDI. These tests are an attempt to find technical solutions which would make it possible to create [sozdat] nuclear weapons in an ABM system with space-based elements. The United States is examining several versions of an ABM system.

First version. Two ABM echelons exist. One of them is ground-based, that is, ground-based means protect cities or missile silos on U.S. territory against a nuclear attack by us. Although, what question of a strike can there be when the USSR has adopted a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons?

The second echelon is based in earth orbit at a height of 500-1,000 km and consists of orbital combat stations equipped with conventional arms. It is not yet a question of nuclear weapons or directed-energy weapons. The second echelon's task is to destroy enemy missiles during their flight to the target.

Second version: Seven ABM echelons based in space. Each of them is designed to destroy enemy missiles at different stages of their flight to the target--at launch, on the active sector of the trajectory, and so forth.

Analysis of SDI carried out by many foreign scientists, including American scientists, indicates that it is an extremely dangerous venture and boils down to an unambiguous military-strategic concept, namely the first strike concept.

The high level of scientific and technical progress now reached by mankind, and by the Soviet Union and the United States above all, really opens up tremendous potential for resolving tasks of very different natures. The American side is trying to narrow all this down or reduce it just to military rivalry.

What, then, is our position? Increasing the arsenals of weapons, wherever they are situated and whatever their nature, defensive or offensive, does not

guarantee security. Great security can only be achieved on condition that the policy of force is renounced. [Khozin ends] Not only ordinary Americans but also sober-minded [word indistinct] politicians and scientists are aware of the illegality of SDI and the danger of the Washington administration's "star mania," which is pernicious for the world. This is stated by Daniel Arbess, executive director of the organization "Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy" and a scientific staffer of the New York Institute of World Politics. The American scientist also examined this question from the viewpoint of international law in his article in the journal BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS: The 1967 treaty on outer space is the chief document of international law governing problems associated with space. It was ratified by more than 100 states, including the United States.

Point 1 of Article IV speaks specifically of restrictions on military activity in space--it prohibits the placing in orbit of "objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction." The nuclear-"pumped" X-ray laser now being created [sozdavat] by the Reagan administration is quite clearly at variance with article IV of the treaty. An X-ray laser is also at variance with Article I of the ABM Treaty, which prohibits nuclear tests or "any other nuclear explosions" in the atmosphere or in space. And such tests will have to be conducted in orbit in order to make sure of the laser's combat readiness.

By presenting the world public with the implementation of SDI as a fait accompli that does not come within the framework of the Geneva talks with the USSR, the U.S. administration is setting the Soviet Union an ultimatum--either agree to a change in the provisions of the ABM Treaty so that the development [razrabotka] and testing of SDI components planned for the period after 1983 comes within the framework of the ABM Treaty, or we for our part will annul that treaty. Instead of displaying goodwill and understanding of the principle of equal security, President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" represents a return to the policy of achieving superiority in arms.

Yu.V. Katasonov: It was, I think, a West German scientist who, describing what is taking place in the world today--the nuclear arms race, the accumulation of huge stockpiles of conventional weapons, and so forth--very aptly recalled words from "Hamlet" and said that this is madness, but it does have its own logic. Indeed, when reacting to particular U.S. foreign policy actions, whether the demonstrative nuclear tests, the bombing of Libya, or the terror against Nicaragua, you must always ask yourself: But why is this madness happening, what is the logic behind it?

We must not forget that the very cruel social and class struggle does not cease in the world for one moment, frequently involving the use of weapons. The present militarist wave, including actions such as the provocative incursion into our 12-mile zone in the Black Sea and the demand to reduce the number of Soviet personnel at the United Nations, are by no means isolated actions. All these are links in a single chain and a single onslaught--the very one that has been conducted against us for decades. This is why I am troubled by the fact that certain people sometimes from the opinion that it is simply necessary to explain our aims and positions a bit more intelligibly to those who are sitting in the White House, and when they understand us everything will at once fall

into place. This is a delusion! The situation here is considerably more complex and considerably more dangerous.

What am I leading up to? To the fact that it would be naive to hope to persuade imperialism to end the arms race with the help of words. Remember Lenin's idea: Capitalism cruelly exploits working people not because it is evil by nature. It is like this socially, and cannot be otherwise. The same can also be said of the present situation: U.S. imperialism is creating [sozdat] new types of arms, conducting nuclear tests, and carrying out aggression against other countries not because it fails to understand something or is deluded about something. This is its nature, and it cannot help doing this. I remember how prominent U.S. politicians would visit our institute. We would spend a long time chatting with them, and they would express very sober thoughts: on detente, disarmament, and so forth. But subsequently, when those people held important state posts, it was as though they had changed. They started acting within the system! This is an example illustrating what I was just saying, only on a smaller, individual scale.

You are right to ask: Can we influence the United States in any way at all? Of course we can, and there are several ways of doing so. First, whether we want this or not, our defenses remain the chief deterrent force today. And we cannot allow the United States to achieve military superiority over our country, for which it is striving so passionately. For what is absolutely military superiority? It is the possibility of inflicting a strike on the other side with impunity.

Second, we must secure allies throughout the world, and this presents no great difficulty for the Soviet Union, because the desire of the overwhelming majority of nonaligned countries coincides with the desire on which our foreign policy is founded--to end the nuclear arms race and ensure lasting peace and security on the earth. However, we must also seek allies in capitalist countries--in the United States itself and in Europe. And here, I believe, it is simply essential to set up contacts at a nongovernment level, particularly at the level of young people. Generations must grow up there who realize the danger of the situation, believe in the good intentions of their coevals in the socialist countries, and seek a truly just and humane way out of the nuclear impasse in which the planet finds itself today.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1371

RELATED ISSUES

MONGOLIAN FOREIGN MINISTER BACKS U.S. ON ASIAN SECURITY

PM141352 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with M. Dugersuren, Mongolian foreign minister, by V. Ganshin under the headline "IZVESTIYA Interview. Reliable Security for Asia"--first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] The statement by the Soviet Government, which sets out proposals to strengthen peace, trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation between the countries of Asia and the Pacific Ocean, has aroused great interest among broad circles of the world public. The Soviet Union's appeal to solve through joint effort the social, economic, and other vital problems of the region has been widely commented on in the Mongolian press, this country being actively in favor of turning Asia into a continent of peace and goodneighborliness. V. Ganshin, our correspondent in Ulaanbaatar, asked M. Dugersuren, Mongolian foreign minister, to talk about the basic aspects of Mongolian foreign policy activity and Mongolia's contribution to the struggle for security and international cooperation.

Strengthening the foundations of security in the Asia and Pacific region, Comrade M. Dugersuren said, has always been and remains one of the main pivots of Mongolian foreign policy. It is precisely for this reason that our country, like the other states in the socialist communist, actively supports the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat and strives to do everything it possible can for the sake of realizing this noble aim.

It is quite natural that the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, in particular its program to eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of the century and the proposal put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress on forming an all-embracing international security system, have the most direct significance for security in Asia and the Pacific region. In his 15 January statement, Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stressed the necessity to eliminate nuclear, chemical, and other mass destruction means everywhere, including on our most populous continent. Also well known is the Soviet Union's intention not to increase the number of medium-range nuclear missiles in the Asian part of its territory. The concept of an integrated approach to the problems of Asian security is an important component of the policy to ensure peace and stability throughout the world. If the United States were to take similar steps, this would signify a perceptible move in the direction of guaranteeing people's security and eliminating the nuclear threat.

Mongolia strives to contribute as far as it can to the joint efforts of fraternal socialist countries in their struggle for peace and the strengthening of mutual trust and understanding between peoples. In 1981 our country put forward a proposal on concluding a convention on a mutual agreement not to attack or use force in relations between Asian and Pacific Ocean states. The peace-loving essence of this proposal is obvious. The ideas inherent in it met with the approval of peoples in the region. This proposal is fully in accord with other constructive initiatives by peace-loving countries. Of course, it will take time to put this proposal into practice, and consistent, persistent efforts, as well as many stage-by-stage measures, will be necessary. We will continue to conduct an active exchange of opinions with interested states for the sake of achieving the goals set.

In order to promote respect for every state's sovereignty, we submitted the question of people's right to peace to be examined by the 39th UN General Assembly session. The UN Declaration on this issue urges all states to take effective measures to ensure that every people has the conditions for peaceful, creative life. The topicality of the declaration is increasing.

In accordance with a decision by the UN General Assembly, made on Mongolia's initiative, a worldwide disarmament action week is held every year. It plays an important role in the struggle by the world public to carry out this most urgent task of today.

The reckless policy of "neoglobalism" or, in other words, the policy of state terrorism, is apparent in the U.S. actions. Its aim is to create a new world order "on the basis of strength," an order that would suit imperialism, and primarily American imperialism. But today not only global but also regional problems cannot be solved from a position of strength. Consistent implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the development of a spirit of realism, goodwill, and cooperation is the only alternative to this aggressive course.

We stand firmly on the side of the fraternal Korean people, who are struggling to unite their country without outside interference, by peaceful means, and on democratic principles. Mongolia supports the DPRK's initiatives regarding the signing of a peace treaty instead of the existing armistice agreement, the adoption of a declaration on nonaggression between North and South, the withdrawal of American troops from the Korean peninsula, and this area's transformation into a nuclear-free zone.

In conclusion I would once again like to stress that one of the main aims of Mongolian foreign policy has always been and will continue to be that of strengthening the foundations of security in the world, the Asia and Pacific region included. Together with the fraternal peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries in the socialist community, we will continue to struggle for the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1371

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA'S MULRONEY ON SCALED DOWN DEFENSE POLICY

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 1 May 86 p A5

[Text] A white paper outlining new defence policies and projects may be released this fall, but it will not be as "attractive or far-reaching" as the Government had hoped, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said yesterday.

The paper — the first comprehensive review of defence policies since 1971 — was postponed because of "economic realities" and is being scaled down, Mr. Mulroney told a news conference.

Increased defence spending and a new defence policy were two of the Conservatives' key election promises, but they have gradually been relegated to the back burner as the Government concentrates on reducing the budget deficit.

"One of the things that we encountered with more brutality than we thought were certain economic realities," Mr. Mulroney said.

That means the Government will not be able to afford some of the defence projects it wanted. "It would have become illusory to put them out in white-paper form if indeed we didn't feel we could afford them ... say, in two or three years."

Mr. Mulroney said Associate Defence Minister Harvie Andre is working on the paper, which he expects to be ready this fall.

The Government is already locked into several costly defence projects over the next few years.

Canada is in the midst of replacing obsolete fighter aircraft with expensive CF-18 Hornets and has just selected a consortium to build a multi-million-dollar, low-level air defence system to protect planes and airfields in Western Europe.

As well, the Government has agreed to modernize Canada's northern radar warning systems shared with the United States and has increased its NATO contingent by 1,200 members.

The Government had expressed a desire to strengthen the Armed Forces Reserves, conduct military exercises in the Far North to increase Canadian claims to Arctic sovereignty, complete the naval frigate program, purchase new submarines and modernize its destroyers.

But defence spending will rise by only 2.75 per cent in the current fiscal year after inflation is taken into consideration. At \$10.2-billion, the increase will be just enough to continue existing programs.

The Conservatives had promised to increase real growth by 6 per cent to make up for what they said were years of Liberal neglect.

/13104

CSO: 5220/37

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS PROTEST CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 28 Apr 86 p A23

[Article by Erike Rosenfeld]

[Text] Canada must bear part of the responsibility for the continuation of the arms race, a group of 1,000 protesters was told Saturday after marching up Yonge Street and over to Queen's Park.

"The nuclear arms race is terrorism," said Angela Browning, chairman of Against Cruise Testing, a coalition of peace, political and student organizations that organized the fourth annual spring protest march.

"Our country bears its heavy load of guilt; by participating in the arms race, we help to keep it going," she said.

"Every time the cruise missile is tested, every time the Mulroney Government opposes proposals such as a nuclear weapons freeze and supports such insanities as Reagan's Star Wars schemes, each and every one of these actions brings us one step closer to nuclear war."

Noting that Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has denied that Canada is officially participating in the United States' strategic defence initiative, she called him a liar and noted several instances in which Canadians are involved in Star Wars-related projects.

"To Mr. Mulroney, we say, 'We want a Government which represents our needs and concerns, not the paranoid delusions of Ronald Reagan,'" she told the cheering crowd.

"The real struggle is not between East and West, but between the people of this planet and the military power which seeks to destroy it."

She said ACT will protest against cruise testing until it is ended.

Scarborough West MPP Richard Johnston told the marchers he expects the Legislature this fall to debate this fall his resolution to make Ontario a nuclear-weapons-free zone.

/13104
CSO: 5220/37

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JUNE 19, 1986

19/6